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Reviewer's report:

Major

This offers a reflective account of undertaking public involvement in a clinical study, and would be most useful for those working in clinical studies, who may lack experience or need convincing about the need for public involvement in their research. The article will probably hold less interest for readers with more experience of public involvement, as the observations on the benefits of public involvement are not unique.

The primary concern is that this is presented as an evaluation study. It would be more accurate to present this as a 'reflective case study' or 'descriptive report'. The piece is based on the team's internal observations of their public involvement experience. The influence of public involvement on patient recruitment is plausible but speculative, though it is appreciated that the authors have reflected on the limitations of this in the discussion.

Minor points:

p.4 it is stated that public involvement emerges from INVOLVE in the UK (line 73). While this has provided an impetus, particularly given funders expectations for PI, there is a longer history of public involvement that predates INVOLVE.

p.4 (line 76) Public involvement in research is distinct from participation where people take part in research studies as participants.

p.5 line 119 - large rather than great?

p.9 line 203-217 - the meaning of this paragraph about funding activities is unclear
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