Reviewer’s report

Title: The effectiveness of the Designated Research Team approach to building research capacity in primary care: A case study analysis

Version: 3 Date: 15 January 2008

Reviewer: Larry Green

Reviewer’s report:

Major Revisions:

1. Methods is still silent on how the 4 investigators resolved different views and perspectives in reviewing their data sources. This can be repaired with a sentence.

2. There remains a serious deficiency of examples of what is being discussed and concluded sufficient for readers unfamiliar with this particular situation to develop a particular understanding of what actually happened.

3. It seems illogical to me that Team 6 could get a check mark in Table 8. The Team 6 statement on page 11 is just insufficient and the authors must offer readers more explanation based on careful analysis about this “failure to start.”

4. The sentence on page 10 starting with “More experienced researchers utilised must be fixed.

5. The discussion has good stuff in it, but it is not easy to grab it. Think about leading off with "This evaluation suggests that the DRT approach was effective in promoting change and development across most principles, and was particularly strong in developing linkages, collaborations, and skills. This is probably the KEY RESULT. Contend with "Supporting closer links with service users in research was poorly developed by the teams." Don't you think your insights can be highlighted more effectively? e.g. The DRT approach did not work with a blank slate, the culture of the host organisation influenced the team's productivity and research impact, congruence between the objective of the team and thos of the organisation also influeneced success.

Minor/Discretionary revisions:

To the extent that it is expected that someone outside of Trent and the UK will understand this, the use of some words is problematic: seconded, usere involvement, backfill, and the way "against" is used are terms/phrases that I do not think will be understood by many. And slipping between present and past tense could be addressed by adopting mostly past tense to the benefit of the paper. Consider putting "in Trent Region in UK in the title.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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