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Reviewer's report:

I think co-creation is a very important subject so relevant to the future of healthcare service provision and research and therefore enlarging the evidence base for co-creation and practical ways in which to undertake it is very beneficial and also practical for those who have no idea how to go about it.

I would be interested in understanding why the case studies chosen were ones which only involved 2 type of stakeholder (actor), i.e. academic researchers and end-users. Was it because there were no other case studies to include which featured more than 2 types of stakeholder or were there other case studies which could have been used but you chose not to use these (and why was this?). It think this additional information should be included in the limitations part of your Discussion.

At line 468 reference is made to evaluation of co-created interventions by using RCTs. Would this not be an appropriate situation to consider utilising pragmatic trials instead of (or at least as well as) RCTs which usually don't include/reflect the real world population (due to their strict inclusion and exclusion criteria). Nor do they usually test how the interventions will actually work in a real life situation within a health care system etc. Pragmatic trials will also assist to gather a real world evidence base which is relevant in evaluating effectiveness and the effect of treatment in routine clinical practice. Pragmatic trials could test the co-created interventions in everyday situations and enable randomization at the point of care.
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