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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editorial Team

Response to reviewers’ comments for the paper: The effectiveness of the DRT approach to building research capacity in primary care (now re-titled, ‘An evaluation of the ‘Designated Research Team’ approach to building research capacity in primary care’).

We thank the reviewers for their most helpful and constructive comments and set out below where we have corrected or clarified our original text.

Response to reviewer Mark Harris

This reviewer suggested that no further revisions were necessary. With this in mind, we have, wherever possible, retained the content and message of the original paper.

Response to reviewer Larry Green

Major Revisions

1. We now state that differing investigator views were resolved by discussion and examination of supporting evidence until consensus was reached.
2. We have significantly reworded the text to clarify the background, research methods, results and discussion and to make the paper more accessible to those unfamiliar with the literature on research capacity building.
3. The check mark suggesting that members of team six remained research active after the DRT period was an error and has been corrected.
4. The grammatical error highlighted has been corrected.
5. The discussion has been edited to clarify the key messages.

Minor Revisions
1. The paper is now mostly in the past tense as suggested and jargon (such as 'backfill' and 'service user') has been eliminated wherever possible.

Response to Sara Shaw

Major Revisions
1. The paper no longer purports to have adopted a case study methodology (the authors concede this was an unhelpful description).
2. Reference to multiple data sources has been amended and, where confusing, deleted.
3. The reference to the principles of Yin and Eisenhardt has been deleted.
4. The study is now presented as an evaluation rather than a theory building exercise.
5. [see point 1 above]

Minor Revisions
6. Reference to Primary Care Research Networks has been standardised.
7. Grammar and spelling has been corrected throughout (apologies for any mistakes that have slipped through the net).
8. The reference to the NHS R&D has been corrected and updated.
9. This statement has been deleted.
10. The section has been reworded to clarify.
11. This text has been removed.
12. Use of “project lead” has been amended.
13. The reference to “examples” of indicators has been amended as suggested.
14. The reference to the “summary of results” has been removed.
15. The incomplete sentence has been corrected.
16. Table 1 has been amended as suggested.

We have systematically been through the paper to address all issues and oversights and hope that you will now find this paper of sufficient interest and quality for your readership. If you have any queries regarding the information you have received, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

J.M.Cooke