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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions

The only response to previous response to reviewers related to competing interests and authors’ contribution section, however, there, were quite a few changes which suggests that authors have responded to other comments.

This is an interesting paper which doesn’t fit neatly into the ‘research paper’ category. This makes it difficult to arrive at a suitable format. Referring to the methods for the EPOCH study, which the PIRg supported, is a little confusing, as it this is not the methods for the information reported in this paper. Since this is not a research paper, it would be better not to have a methods section. Perhaps the information about the EPOCH study could come under the heading “EPOCH study” which could follow the Background section. The section starting “The study recruited 121 ……” in the abstract now looks odd at the end of the discussion section. If this is an indicator of the impact of public involvement, then this should be made clearer.

I would advise proof reading the paper. The full stop is missing at the end of paragraph 2 on page 4. The next paragraph starts with “They”. Either join it to the previous paragraph or change “They” to “PIRg”. There is an error at the start of paragraph 5 on page 8 (The study exploratory). There is an orphaned sentence in the conclusions (Future studies….). This could be joined to the following section.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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