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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Staniszewska and Mr. Stephens,

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript entitled “Patient involvement in cardiovascular research: a qualitative impact evaluation” to be submitted for publication in the Research Involvement and Engagement. We would like to thank the reviewers and the editors for reviewing the manuscript again and are pleased that they believe the manuscript became more interesting after the previous revisions. The main comments of this second review were on translational glitches.

Below we provide a point-by-point explanation of how we have responded to these comments:

- For the most part the English reads well, but there remains a few translational glitches.

For instance, the final part of this following sentence needs clarification. “This finding was confirmed by the interviewees, although some stressed to use later on during the execution of the research.” Do you mean that the researchers who were interviewed indicated that, whilst the input was left out of the design of the study, it was incorporated into the study itself?

The interpretation of the reviewer is correct. Several researchers expressed their intention to incorporate the committee’s advice later on, during the execution of their study. The sentence in the abstract is changed to the following: “This finding was confirmed by the interviewees, although some stressed to use the committee’s advice later on during the execution of the research.” Later on in the manuscript, in line 226 to 242, this finding is described in more detail.

- We also think you may mean “timing” whenever you mention “moment”? If so, could you also change wherever you change these?

We thank the reviewers for addressing this translational glitch; ‘timing’ is the right word indeed. Throughout the manuscript, both in texts and in the figures, ‘moment’ is replaced by the word ‘timing’.
We think that the manuscript improved by these revisions and we hope that you will now find it suitable for publication.

We look forward to hearing from you,

Yours sincerely,

The authors