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Reviewer's report:

Overall a clearly written paper with good definition of methods used, clear results and excellent description of the various process to develop and refine the intervention, and evaluate it from different stakeholders point of view. A great deal of value internationally for others wishing to develop training of this type.

The rationale for developing the training is clearly stated - in terms of perceived need, and the drivers arising from SPOR. While the Foundations process was clearly strong on involving patients in design, delivery and refinement of the curriculum it is not clear if the demand or need for the training was identified by professionals on patients' behalf.

Authors rightly point out a lack of literature/evidence describing the process of co-producing training programs or curricula relating to PE/PPI. The rationale for developing the training is described but as stated above does not discuss to what extent there was any "bottom up" patient/service-led demand if any, and if there was how this was expressed or channelled.

I would have liked more detail on the process for recruiting the advisory reference group - were patients recruited already involved/co-opted or was the call put out more widely?

Results have been presented clearly and supplementary materials, including module and workshop details very helpful.

The discussion section highlights the aim for Foundations to dovetail into "further training or real-world POR opportunities through SPOR SUPPORT Units or SPOR Networks" but no timescale is given for this, or examples of if this has happened. If the timescale since the pilots were run and evaluated is too soon to say the authors should state this, and say that such further training and opportunities are still an aspiration at this stage. The conclusion section highlights that the initiative has "built capacity for POR" but as above does not state if this has been quantified in any way or harnessed yet.

Although laypeople/patients/public are thanked and acknowledged there were none as co-authors, so a paper written exclusively by professionals and practitioners. While a patient/public co-author would not be necessary in itself, or for its own sake, the lack of lay co-authors is at odds with the genuine co-production and close collaboration with patients/public in the rest of the initiative.
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