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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript is a revision of a paper describing an effort to enhance the involvement of patients and stakeholders. A model (called SUCCESS) is presented following eight years of work and involving 218 research activities.

The authors' revisions have greatly improved the paper and this reviewer is appreciative of the responsiveness to previous comments. Each item was fully addressed and my previous points, particularly relating to some methods and Table 1, have had additional data and discussion included to enable a better understanding of how things were done. The details provided are appropriate for a methodological paper and do provide some important insights for others either seeking to understand the value of stakeholder engagement or interested in applying approaches in this model. The comment in reference to controls from the standard questions to reviewers is marked accordingly since it would have been difficult to implement a control arm for what is described.

The only relatively minor points to raise to the authors attention is that in addressing comments, there are a few areas that may seem redundant.

1) Line 136-138 provide a bit more detail than what is is provided in the recruitment flyer (Appendix 1). Appendix 1 is again referenced later in the Methods section (Line 146).

2) Lines 216-219 and 309-310 address 4 participants' situations and can probably reference each other.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Yes

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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