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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript offers a clear and comprehensive description of the development and implementation of a PPI group with young adults for a research programme in diabetes. The team is to be commended on this work. The manuscript is very informative.

I have one major issue and a few minor points.

Study Methods page 5, line 51: The authors describe PPI using the NIHR INVOLVE definition however their first heading under methods is 'study' which includes a detailed description of ethical approval. This may confuse the reader. It needs to be clear that the PPI in itself is not a study and does not require ethical approval. The research (which isn't the topic of the manuscript) needed ethical approval, not the PPI.

Minor:

Abstract: Page 3, line 23: is 'techniques' the correct term, is it not designs, methods or procedures?

page 5, line 37: The manuscript is well written with only a few research terms needing more description e.g. Discrete Choice Experiments should also be explained in the text.

page 6, line 21: Consider adding the role in implementation of research findings here

Page 9, line 16: Bullet points might look better in a box

Page 11, line 39: If members are not representative can you explain why e.g. from figure 1?

Page 11, line 43: payment approach needs to be earlier in the methods

Discussion: A comment upon the likely sustainability and potential for grant co-application would be informative

Figure and table titles would benefit from more detail
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