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Reviewer's report:

The authors are to be commended for taking the time to write up their observations of a method which has the potential to be useful to others. It's a generally a very easy to read article and my comments are intended just to tease out that 'demonstrable advance on current practice' and guide the reader.

1. Title: I recommend tempering the title given the nature of the current evaluation and placement of the article. Consider 'an alternative method of engaging …'

2. Language: Watch the use of adjectives and make sure you substantiate claims with references, e.g. p5 ln 108 'good step' – reference?

3. Guideposts: Most journal articles are research articles or commentary, so readers may value some extra guideposts. For example, in the introduction it can be useful to tell the reader that this is a methodological article and then clearly write the aim of the article and the approach you will be taking (e.g. are you describing the practice based on x no. of sessions, comparing to past practice and reflecting on its value using feedback surveys. Then use that to keep the rest of the article in line.

4. I really like the links to further data, but please explain the data sets and don't use vague descriptions like 'over a number of years'. If you use quantitative data, please give us the numbers.

5. Your first paragraph in background is useful for explaining the issue of work with this group of patients, but then it becomes a bit of a general review of things happening in this space. What I really want to know is what are the specific outcomes you seek to achieve by bringing patients (referencing the lit that supports this sort of work) and researchers together given you've just made it clear how valuable the patients' time is. Is it that researchers use it to scope better questions, inform outcome measures or patients to make contact with trials or whatever?. Then when you look at the results, the reader will have a better sense of if it is achieving these outcomes and where further work is required or how they might build on it

6. Consider looking at Kristina Staley's recent papers which may add support or point of comparison to background and discussion

7. p. 14 ln 305 - how is engagement different from PPI? I would be inclined just to say PPI rather
than getting into an explanation of a difference which may not be widely shared.

I look forward to seeing the revised article as I believe it will be very useful for people working in this field because you have clearly gained a lot of insight into your method. I just need a few more specifics to see what you have seen.
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