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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the very helpful suggestions of the reviewers. Please find below a comment-by-comment response to the reviewers’ suggestions.

Reviewer reports:

Melissa Petrakis, PhD (Reviewer 1):

COMMENT:

The paper needs to make it clear that the names of participants are either used with consent or have been changed to protect privacy and confidentiality.

RESPONSE:

This has been explicitly stated in the revised manuscript (Findings, p 10)

COMMENT:
Watch over-long paragraphing - it would be better if the paragraph across pages 17-18 (as numbered by the authors) was divided into 2 paragraphs for readability.

RESPONSE:

We have revised this paragraph and split it into three separate paragraphs to improve readability.

Bridget Elizabeth Hamilton, RN, BPN, BN(Hons), PhD (Reviewer 2):

COMMENT:

My only suggestions relate to methods/methodology section. I wonder if the authors have considered and addressed the COREQ standards for reporting qualitative papers? (see https://protect-au.mimecast.com/s/38L3BqU9XoKha?domain=academic.oup.com).

The abstract notes that "One PIR service engaged a consumer-led research team". Then in the methods section a sensible case is put for the consumer lead research approach, but important details of method and process are lacking from the paper.

Please could the authors consider items that relate to reflexivity and positioning of researchers (COREQ domain 1), interview setting and theoretical framing (domain 2). A theoretical frame helps to make explicit the assumptions that underpin data collection and analysis. In any qualitative research there is value in providing enough detail for the reader to understand where the research is coming from. Reflexive detail is useful in this situation, where consumer-led research is intentionally aligned to service user experiences. The following questions help to explain what is the nature of the alignment between the research team and the participants?

I have listed a few specific questions that should be addressed, to strengthen the manuscript:

Which consumer researchers/authors conducted the interviews?

What were the researchers' credentials, experience or training, that prepared them for the research?

What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research?

Were the researchers themselves experienced in providing or receiving PIR program - ie were they bringing an 'insider' researcher experience to this evaluation of PIR?

Did age, gender or ethnicity of researchers and participants have any impact on recruitment or on interviews?
What was the nature of the relationship between the researchers and the PIR service and/or PIR service users, if any?

Would the interview participants have known the researchers, and if so what difference might this have made to recruiting or to participants' freely relaying their experience at interview?

Domain 2: study design

What methodological orientation underpinned the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis.

Data analysis as described seems inductive and interview data seems to be handled as pragmatic or somewhat phenomenological, accounts of the participants' 'truth'. A critical theory frame seems to implicitly underpin the case for consumer led research.

Where were the interviews conducted - ie on a support service site or participant homes or other? How did the setting impact on (service user engagement in) interviews?

What were the reflexive views of interviewers and team before and after conducting the study? e.g. assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic?

RESPONSE:

Thank you for this suggestion. We have revised the methods section so that each COREQ domain is addressed specifically. Each comment / suggestion has been incorporated into this revised version of the methods section.