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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

Abstract:

Can this sentence be made clearer - for example, example, defining 'scientific approaches' ‘However, if scientific approaches are designed in such a way as to take these factors into account, the findings may not be generalisable.’

Keywords - consider adding more if allowed - ‘consumer’ may bring this up in Australian searches and ‘citizen’ in Canadian. Perhaps adding ‘measure’ to impact and the word ‘evidence’?

Insert ‘if’ to be more balanced ‘It is expected that evidence gained through empirical methods will provide a definitive answer to the question ‘Is public involvement in research worth doing?’ and identify IF, when, where and how involvement brings benefits.’

Section: The complex nature of patient and public involvement in research

Change to ‘Participant information sheet’ ‘For example, if involvement is restricted to asking the public to comment on a Participant information sheet’

Perhaps add a comment on the support they are given to be involved?
‘Therefore the involvement process is not simply about the ‘method’ used to seek people’s views, but also precisely what patients/ the public are asked to contribute, what specific recommendations they make and what action is taken in response to their input.’

Section: The impact of involvement as experiential knowledge

Suggested insertion in block capitals ‘In practice, it is therefore often the researcher who DIRECTLY experiences the impact of involvement, WITH THE WIDER IMPACT POTENTIALLY FELT BY THE PUBLIC’ e.g. better research.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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