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Reviewer’s report:

An interesting article which demonstrates good practice regarding patient involvement. Looking at both staff and patient perspectives simultaneously, then using the findings to facilitate the patient group may have increased the chance of effective PPI.

Need to re frame and change the title. It is not looking at patient and public involvement in clinical trials but at patient involvement in a UTI trial. This is true throughout the whole article. It is looking at patient Involvement not, patient and public involvement as there are no general members of the 'public' involved.

The article is very long and while this is in part due to the fact that you are exploring both motivation and expectation from two perspectives, it does make it more difficult to read and to pull out your key findings. I suggest that you place some of the findings in tables and reduce the discussion.

Lines 78, 81, 90, 91 and 93 are missing references. For example you state: "there have been few studies" but do not give any examples.

Aims should be in methods section - as per the author instructions.

There is a line that mentions that the qualitative study is also part of a PhD project. Needs further explanation or removing.

Twelve minutes are very short interviews to cover both topics (motivations and expectations). This is not reflected on in the limitations section of the report.

Theoretical positioning missing from methods.

Why telephone interviews not face to face?

If you address these points with particular attention to the key finding and overall length, this paper will be a useful contribution to the PPI field.
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