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Reviewer's report:

The paper is generally satisfactory.

It is a shame that some of the PPI participants were not asked to contribute to writing the paper as co-authors.

The researchers should consider inviting a lay PPI person to be part of their funding submission team to be involved in all aspects of the research as and equal up to and including co-authoring any papers as well as the research report. This is a major omission in this research and is a requirement of some funding bodies which could be mentioned in the paper.

A major omission in the paper is a statement of the % of total cost and time of the project to PPI activities and how this was split across the various parts of the study. This should be used to enhance the discussion section as well as the conclusions, especially lines begging 455, 259, 543, 523.

Even though a list of abbreviations is given, they should be defined in full when first used.

Abstract is satisfactory

Background is satisfactory.

Plain English summary is satisfactory
The methodology is satisfactory, though it should be stated the amount of lay representation used in the study design.

The quotes from participants gives added incite to the paper.

It would add to the paper is the reasons why the community suggestions were not acted upon could be discussed.

Data relating to the metropolitan non metropolitan split should be included as well as a detailed discussion of the issues it raised in relation to PPI.

The recommendations should be split into requirements and suggestions and discussed in more depth
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