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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting article that highlights the issues of including PPI proper into research proper. I think the authors have addressed the comments by previous reviewers. However, I have a couple of questions/comments for the authors.

Page 6 Line 22 - participants were already known SUC's who had knowledge of research process. There is no justification for using these participants and no comment about how this might have affected the outcomes of the training. These participants found the training difficult and it sounds as though health literacy for research was not considered by the team. A research naive bunch would probably have been totally lost. This is a serious limitation of the evaluation.

Page 14 Line 1 - There are always some participants that are more forthright than others and the facilitator needs to be very experienced to ensure everyone has a say. One limitation might be that there were two large groups - quite daunting for PPI. Having smaller groups would have helped with inclusiveness.

Page 14 Line 22 - The authors comment on the "difficulty to unpick the deeply embedded power imbalances...", but fail to mention that research is difficult and complicated, especially for ethics and gaining approval of committees. There will always be power imbalance between people with knowledge and people without knowledge of a certain field.

Page 14 Line 50 - The authors make an interesting point about how PPI could be used effectively in research.
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