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Reviewer’s report:

Partners in Recovery (PIR) programs are new and innovative initiatives in the Australian landscape; it is good to see them being evaluated, and even more pleasing to see consumer voices included in such evaluations - in this case in a consumer-led study.

The description of the program will be helpful to unfamiliar local and/or overseas readers.

The method, with equal numbers of consumer and academic researchers, demonstrates a good modelling of co-production.

Informed consent and a qualitative approach, with audio-taped interviews, seems appropriate and likely to illicit the information sought.

Seeking additional participants until data saturation was reached is appropriate here.

The use of direct quotes is effective here.

The critique of existing tools to capture recovery progress in the discussion section is an interesting and useful addition to the literature.

The tables are clear and convey information well.

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.

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.

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