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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

Thank you for providing me the opportunity to read this paper.

The paper is interesting. However, it also raises multiple questions and concerns. Too often the claims about the success of the engagement and the representativeness of the stakeholders seem to be out of synch with the methodology, data collected and results.

Especially as throughout the paper so much emphasis was put on representativeness and the underrepresented, it is disturbing not to know the actual number of stakeholders by category and their demographics. This probably represents the main weakness of the paper.

After a second reading of the results and the limitations, it seems like the paper was written as a secondary analysis of the stakeholder engagement initiative (i.e., it was not planned from the outset). It would be relevant to mention it if it is the case, as it will alleviate somewhat the expectations towards the evaluation of the event/study.

That being said, the paper is interesting and even if it is less successful in the end than it is claimed, it may still provide insight for the Research Involvement and Engagement community.

Specific Comments

p.5 L109 I would refrain from using "believed" in such context, especially as the value of PER is debated and speculative. Also, please support that with refs; unless you state that it is you (the authors) that hold such belief.

p.5 L124+ Please contextualize in this paragraph what are the stages during which patients are more often involved (i.e., early and late stages rather than over the course of a research project).
The total number of stakeholders needs to be indicated in the first paragraph of the Methods.

The language makes it unclear whether patients were part of Day 1, if it's not the case please explain why.

Please clarify and describe what kind of compensation was offered to Community member/patient partners (as well as the rules for accessing the bursary program).

Please clarify your expectations of appropriate representation

In Table 1, it is unclear the distinction between Community member and Community member/patient partners?

Also the numbers of participants per category would be much more helpful than binary Y/N.

It is disturbing not to know at this point of the paper, the actual number of stakeholders by category and their demographics (as well as to understand how many participants were invited for Day 1 and 2).

Table 1 is hard to read; I would suggest reformatting it.

Would you consider adding all materials (such as the pre-meeting survey) in Supplement Files, so that the research community could benefit from your work?

In addition to provincial privacy regulations, did the respondents signed an informed consent to comply with Canadian research ethics guidance? If so, please mention it. If not, please justify why.

Since you detailed the timeline for the save the date, it would only be coherent to add when the pre-meeting survey was sent.

This paragraph raises many questions that may be resolved if the survey was available to readers.

Consider moving this paragraph in the previous section as (unless I am mistaken) it did not happen during Day 1.

Please mention the three themes.

Criteria for representativeness should be presented before (i.e, p.9 L218)

"We were 287 moderately successful in our representation targets" This statement on its own is really insufficient given the importance of representativeness throughout the paper.
The methodology of the post-meeting survey would require much more clarity. Are Figures 2 and 3 reporting the results for the 2-days? If so, this seems strange as the aims and populations of the 2 days are quite different. As is the results seem misleading.

Results should be presented in a much more granular way and by broad category. A focus on the perspectives from the Community member/patient partners is crucial, if not it is really difficult to assess the success of engaging them.

This "report". Do you mean article/paper?

Given the lack of granularity of demographics and of the results the paper cannot say the following: "Overall, this 2-day community engagement event was successful in engaging with a multi-sector group of stakeholders from typically underrepresented communities across a broad geographic region".

The paper does not provide enough information to justify the following statement: "Our evaluation has revealed that we were successful at meeting our objectives, although there remain some gaps in our representation targets."

Please specify for the readers the implication of each level.

Could you please explain how the relationships and connections are expected to be maintained and nurtured?

How did the community members in attendance expressed their needs? Please clarify.

"Based on our representation targets, we were able to deliver a reasonably inclusive event." The whole paragraph seems to contradict previous claims of success. This limitation should have been mentioned earlier!

"Lessons Learned" is really interesting and would benefit from being further developed considering the limitations of the study and data collection.

Reimbursement process is indeed a really important concern.

Given the limitations and the lack of demographics, please refrain from unilaterally stating that the event was successful (i.e., "This 2-day community engagement event was successful in reaching a wide range of community members from a broad and geographically diverse region." This statement is difficult to hold and require more justification.)

Unless it is due to the system upload, please provide a better quality for the figures.

Figure 2 and 3, please indicate that it is expressed in %. Also, did all participants responded to every question (i.e., Is the n the same for all questions?)
Could you please identify clearly where is Prince George in Figure 1? This would give a better idea of the geographical considerations of hosting the event there.
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