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Reviewer's report:

The authors are to be commended in using a novel analytic strategy to increase knowledge about how relatively under-reported stakeholders view clinical research and in seeking to identify the meanings and role attached to collaboration and social value in research.

At the same time the manuscript has several shortcomings that need to be addressed in a revision:

Background:

- The rationale for examining "collaborative partnership" and "social value" through the voice of participants is not well-argued nor presented. More specifically the others note that the matrix coding identified instances that referred to these concepts within the texts but they do not explicate specifically what words were sought out. Further they do not present the different meanings phraseology used by participants to talk about these topics

Methods/Findings:

- The Qualitative analyses is missing quotations, and quantification of findings (how common were themes) nor identification of what the similarities and differences were between the 2 different types of data sources/participants. This makes it hard to assess qualitative rigor and how cognitive biases of the primary analyst were checked for.

- No reflexivity check was performed nor coding details provided

Findings/Discussion:

- The manuscript rambles on and one is hard-pressed to find what is novel and important. I think the authors should lead with those findings as opposed to repeating ideas that are well-known.
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.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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