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Reviewer’s report:

This timely paper reports on an important topic, an evaluation of a community support initiative, from the most important perspectives of consumers/service users. This kind of work provides essential findings in the Australian service context of re-contracting support services. The research team are to be congratulated on gathering and presenting rich data. Also the analysis contributes a valuable recovery-focused appraisal of a standard needs based assessment tool, the CANSAS.

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://academic.oup.com/intqhc/article/19/6/349/1791966/Consolidated-criteria-for-reporting-qualitative).

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?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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

Yes

**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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