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Reviewer's report:

The response of the lead author to previous reviewer requests, particularly in the development of the lay summary, appears adequate.

This excellent paper details the SEED approach to eliciting stakeholder involvement in the development of a research agenda. Stakeholders include patients and carers, clinical care providers, funders and gatekeepers. The SEED method employs face to face small 'like group' interactions over a sustained period to develop and refine areas of interest and concern. The resulting questions are reviewed in terms of current published knowledge and practice by the university leads and amended or focused in relation to identified 'gaps'.

The face to face community based nature of SEED marks it out from the more usual sampling style methods of encouraging participation in the broader based development of research agendas. Its strength lies in its detailed method, its localised and conversational focus, and its potential for creating 'community capacity for sustained research engagement'. Its ability to generate research questions with a wide currency may be limited. However, the approach is both welcome and timely and worthy, as the authors indicate, of further development. Future work may wish to more explicitly explore the political distinctions between 'engagement' and 'involvement' and consider the ethics of co-production in the practice of shaping multi-stakeholder generated research agendas.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal