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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for inviting me to review this interesting paper which describes a novel method of disseminating research findings. Though the topic is cancer in young people, the paper will be of interest to anyone who wants their research to reach a wide audience. However, there were some aspects of the paper which could be addressed to improve clarity:

1) Paper aims and conclusions: the aim was to describe the development of the performance and to offer 'insight into the impact' on various stakeholders. The paper does do this, but it would be helpful to have a bit more clarity around what the authors were trying to or expecting to achieve. For instance, was expanding reach the main aim? The conclusions state that using theatre to present research enabled the results to be accessible to a larger, more diverse audience - but larger than what? More diverse than what? How was this measured? Or was increasing interest or participation in research an aim? It appears to be from the questions in Table 3, but this wasn't explicitly stated - though, in the PES it is stated that 'however not all audience members realised the play was based on real study results' which may relate to this? In the PES, the authors state that 'audience feedback agreed that theatre was an effective way to disseminate study results in terms of increasing cancer knowledge and awareness'- this implies that this was an aim, was it?

The paper would be clearer if the authors explicitly stated the aims and then described what methods they used to address each. This would also enable them to make the conclusions clearer, at the moment, different conclusions have prominence in the abstract compared with the PES compared with the discussion. Clarity around this would make the 'take home message' of the paper clearer.

2) I understand that the actors chose how to present Brightside results, but I wasn't clear what the results were until I read the 'take home messages' in appendix 2. It would be useful to have these stated early in the paper. Was there any evaluation of whether the audience received these messages?

3) p3 -'more non-traditional methods….are expanding rapidly' - is there evidence for this? A reference is needed.

4) p8 'a total of 1,377 people' - it would be interesting to know approximate proportions of the public vs professionals vs service users/carers - if possible, perhaps by saying how many attended each of the different performances.
5) P8 'most audience participants strongly agreed' - since only 15% responded, this statement is a bit misleading. Better to say, 'of those who responded…'

6) P10 'nine members of the cast…'out of how many? How were these selected?

7) workshops - it would be interesting to have a bit more detail as to what happened at these workshops, it would help those wanting to do something similar.

8) p11 - para 3, 'having to consider fertility options' - this warrants more explanation for non-cancer specialists

9) it would be helpful to have an identifier with quotes to demonstrate to the reader that a broad range of views was expressed, and that all the quotes aren't from one person.

10) reflective diaries - what method was used for this? Were participants given any instructions?

11) Discussion - impact is attributed to the director and assistant directors 'embracing what we wanted to achieve. - I wasn't clear on what data this statement was based.

12) p13 - 'on reflection not being in control' - this needs clarifying/rewording

13) Table 3 - add Total N

**Typos**

Abstract, results: change approximate to approximately
P5 - para 1 change effect knowledge to effective knowledge
P6 - para 1 change time spend to time spent
P7 - para 3 add apostrophe to casts (cast's personal)
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