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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting discussion paper on an important topic. The authors are right to point out that RECs do not have sufficient guidance for reviewing applications involving co-design and implementation research. I found the authors' recommendations to be useful and interesting. I have no substantive recommendations for improving the paper, but would like to draw the authors' attention to the following minor issues:

1. page 6, point 6, I wonder if 'stakeholder' should be pluralised.
2. page 10, 2nd paragraph, line 4, I wonder if 'who' should come after 'members'.
3. page 11, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, the authors may wish to reference the joint NRES/INVOLVE guidance on PPI and research ethics, which considers this issue - http://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/INVOLVENRESfinalStatement310309.pdf
4. page 12, last line, I wonder if the authors need to more explicit by saying 'the types of research ethics applications' or 'the types of applications that are received by research ethics committees', and I was not clear by what was meant by the phrase,'how they have been addressed'.
5. pages 12-13, I think the authors need to be a bit more clear about which organisations are best placed to collate and disseminate learning points in key countries - such as, for example, NRES/HRA in the UK.
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