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Author’s response to reviews:

The first is concerned with methodology. You have selected this as a methodological paper and we could like to add a paragraph explaining why such methodological papers of the process of PPI are important to the wider community. We agree they are, but think you can strengthen this argument. The process of PPI from a methodological perspective is vital to building effective practice, so please add a little more on that.

You have raised a very good point. We have added a short paragraph at the end of the 'Background' section.

The second thing is to add a fuller explanation of why longer quotes are used. We agree that they can be very powerful but they are much longer than usual, so please add in a sentence or two to explain why.
We have done this, and added more explanation before the quotes. We have worked with the two PPI Panel members to amend these slightly, but in the light of the purpose of the paper they add the voice of the panel on their motivation for joining the panel. One of them was recruited via an email that went to Foundation Trust members, the other was approached directly by one of the research team – these were our two most successful methods of seeking people overall. Not only to they say a little bit about what made them respond to the invitation and the particular experience they bring, but also they illustrate some of the things that were important to them in the process.