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Reviewer's report:
Patient involvement in cardiovascular research: A qualitative impact evaluation

General comments
Thank you for the opportunity to review this research paper. I enjoyed reading the article and do think many people, both researchers and patients would find the study results interesting. My suggestions to the team are minor but the theoretical stance needs some further work. By addressing the theory the paper will be much stronger. I like the paper's message - which comes through strongly that involvement of patients helps researchers refocus their applications for funding.

Detailed comments
Plain English summary
Point 3 'make patients advice more binding' I found hard to interpret what this meant - can the point be made more clearer in what you mean by 'binding' for readers?

Theoretical background
Clarity is needed: Was Tambuyzer et al's study on diversity added to Brett et al's Framework? I wonder why/how the importance of diversity is not already part of the overarching processes? Surely the PIRICOM (Brett et al. study) discusses diversity?

What I am suggesting is to maybe define 'process' from Brett et al in your own way and to include within it 'diversity'. I would have thought that ensuring diversity would fit under the umbrella of processes. This would mean removing Tambuyzer et al altogether.

GRIPP 2 works well as an evaluation framework for impact of your work. Perhaps while you are responding to the previous point about diversity and process, you could amend the diagram 2 to include key things from GRIPP 2 for impact.

Methods
Could a reference be added to the Document analysis, Semi structured interviews and Focus group? This will show that the team are familiar with particular techniques in each of these methods.

The coding for the Figure two will need to reflect the point made earlier about the theoretical clarity asked for.

Discussion
Could this section pick up the point about the panel members being highly educated and trained and the implications this might have on their layness and the discussion around diversity? In the UK there are debates about lay and scientific knowledge that patients bring and readers may find it helpful to know that you are mindful of such debates.
Could you comment on how useful GRIPP 2 was for this study? For example reimbursements for patients involved?

Thank you for the opportunity to review this work.
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