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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

N/A - no experiments or analyses

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

N/A - no results to interpret

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

 Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The paper describes the steps used to develop a model of patient-public involvement in research. It's a good idea to try and describe how this is done as it may
serve as guidance (and lessons learnt) to others wishing to do something similar and may reduce some of the 're-inventing the wheel' that occurs for these types of activities. To be useful to others, there are a few more details needed in some steps. There's of course some concern about generalisability of the 'model' created, so this should be readily acknowledged, but is only touched on very briefly.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

This paper largely describes the steps/elements of the model that was created and used. There aren't really any results per se (other than numbers of service users participating) or interpretation. The focus is on the methods and as such, every step and every element should be thoroughly described (which the authors acknowledge the importance of in the intro). Some details are missing, such as:

- details of the honorarium provided and types of expenses
- was involvement limited to only adults or also parents of children with chronic conditions?
- the actual information provided about the task, role, and resources
- did the workshop only occur once? (if so, at the beginning of the 8 year period described?) how long did it go for?
- how were service users encouraged/expected to respond to the workshop notes? (which none did) - e.g. by email, phone?
- should the 4 service users who weren't active in any way still be considered members of the panel?
- how often were the steering group meetings held?

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Other than additional methods detail (examples given above), further acknowledgement of the limitations (and lack of generalisability) is needed - e.g. only 1 carer participated, only adults with particular chronic conditions, members were drawn from existing networks (which many countries don't have), etc

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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