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Reviewer's report:

The plain English summary is very clear. It would however be useful to add a final paragraph highlighting the value of public research team members collaborating in the study and the challenges that were encountered.

The only other change I suggest to the plain English summary is to replace the phrase "care in selecting a nice environment" with "taking care to create a comfortable training environment". Maybe only a personal opinion but to my mind this reads better.

The Abstract also gives a useful summary of study. However the first Methods paragraph is unclear on first reading when describing how public members of the evaluation team contributed to the study. Clarity would be improved by the following redrafts "....public members of the evaluation team were co-collaborators....." and "This is evidenced by public team members' roles in undertaking....".

On page 10 readability would be improved by avoidance of the terms 'pedagogic' (line 23) and 'pedagogical' (line 55) which are not in common use. These should be removed altogether or replaced by plain English phrases.

On page 13 line 35 readability may be improved by replacing the term 'heterogeneity' with 'diversity'.

On page 14 line 33 readability may be improved by replacing the term 'paradigm' with 'model' or 'pattern.'
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