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Reviewer’s report:

1. I think that this paper is based on a really interesting, and ostensibly unexplored premise. I congratulate the authors for their work.

2. Page 5, Findings: I think it could be clearer whether the categories of waste were identified (which I read as 'thought up by') or chosen (ie from an existing list).

3. I wondered if the meaning of each category could be described briefly, as has been done for 'prioritisation of research' (line 52), either in the body of the text or in an appendix - for example, people who are unfamiliar with the Lancet series on waste might wonder in what sense patient and public involvement is an area of waste.

4. Page 6, line 16: were the barriers to PPIE chosen from an existing list or suggested by respondents?

5. Are these barriers in order of importance?

6. Page 6, line 17: Should this read 'NOT being taken seriously'? I think 'power imbalances' (presumably between researcher and patient rep) and 'dynamics of academic institutions' would benefit from brief explanation.

7. I think the paper raises awareness of the untapped potential of PPIE to contribute to the reduction of waste in research, but I felt like it was missing a clear, practical call to action to the research community (especially those who might be sceptical or unsure about PPIE - I'm conscious that you're preaching to the converted with me). Do the authors have any recommendations for next steps, or for further investigation into this area?

8. Page 6, Conclusions: I agree that "PPIE representatives need to be supported to enable them to recognise and challenge wasteful practices." But do the authors have any reflections on how this can be done? Someone new to this or unsure about PPIE might just think "how?" in response to this.

9. Some of the sentences are very long, I'd suggest breaking them up a bit (eg on page 6: lines 29-33, 30-37; page 7: lines 2-5, 8-10).

10. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this paper, which I think is a useful addition to the literature on PPIE in research.
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