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Reviewer's report:

Hello, this is a well-written paper, however, I think it should be shortened and made more concise. In addition, except for the the different patient groups - what is the real difference between this paper and reference 25? Reference 25 is written as a research paper and structured that way. The new paper seems to be a ramble of what happened and should be shortened throughout. The reflective part was good but did not address all the issues that were raised through the paper. Despite PPI, there seemed to be a general lack of awareness as to what would be suitable training for lay people to accomplish analysis. In addition, there is no consideration of the welfare of people with long-term health conditions - this should be raised in the reflection. There is concern that PPI can become experts when they have had a little training and therefore are no longer true PPI. Research with PPI should be co-production - even in writing of manuscripts.

The second paragraph of the abstract is written in a technical, inaccessible way. What are touch points/trigger terms, what do you mean? Line 35 of the discussion provides a much better description of the analytic task.

Abstract Method - who was involved, how many, how were they recruited, what criteria was used?

Abstract results - what themes were similar, what new insights?

Abstract conclusion - again lack of insight into what lay people, especially those with long-term health conditions can do, especially when they are brought in for just one part of the research process.

"user reflections" - what do you mean?

Background

line 33-37 is clunky. The whole section should be shortened.

PPI
This could be shortened and more detail added about frameworks used for PPI input. The authors talk of health research and there NIHR have produced a framework. There should be more evidence about where PPI has been used or not within the framework. See:

Patient-Centred Outcomes Research Institute [https://www.pcori.org/].


P. 8 line 16 - shows that even PPI have different ideas and stories that will shape research analysis.

line 38 - why include PTE method?

P. 10 What is EBCCD? - should not be shortened title

line 14-19 - researcher chose film clips - hardly PPI! Shown later to not represent what the PPI felt were the important points. Need care here.

P. 11

Weakness - not using local film clips takes the research out of context and may not be as pertinent to the PPI.

line 30 - PPI found the films chosen by the researcher to be too negative and not reflect their own views. Lack of PPI - should be added to limitations

P. 17

line 10 - typo

P. 24

line 35 - PPI had previously been upset whilst taking part in the research - what were the safety features for this study? Was counselling offered to those affected? Again, also lack of insight into PPI
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