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Author's response to reviews:

We thank the reviewers very much for their useful and constructive comments. These comments are addressed as follows in the revised manuscript:

Comments by Vic Neufeld (Discretionary Revisions)

1. We appreciate the fact that IndiaCLEN, and some other groups, are beginning to realise the importance of public health research. However, this has not reached a stage of making a big impact in the country. To add this in the paper would take up a fair bit of space, as reference would have to be made to several small groups of researchers, which would likely break the flow of the point that we have made briefly. On the other hand, an initiative that took place after the submission of the initial version of this paper, could have a significant impact on building public health research in India, and this is now mentioned on page 12 last paragraph and the reference for this is added [28].

2. We are not able to directly link-up these BMJ references to the points that we have made in this paper.

Comments by Carla Patterson (Discretionary Revisions)

1. We like the title suggested by the reviewer and have used it in the revision.

2. These six papers on intervention straddle the existing categories, and therefore creation of new categories would pose problems. We, however, agree with the importance of the issue raised by the reviewer, and hope that in future work we would be able to address it in a tangible way.

3. Once again, we appreciate this point made by the reviewer and its importance. We believe much more needs to be done to understand the deficiency of intervention research in India, and we hope that our group and others would contribute to this in the future.

4. This part of the paper is our understanding of the major issues that need to be addressed to build-up public health research in India. We prefer to avoid extensive discussion of each issue including referencing, as the paper would become too long. We hope that these issues would be dealt with in more detail in future papers.

5. We think that it is not suitable to make comparisons with the mentioned earlier paper, as the methodologies used in that paper and ours are very different and it is not possible to draw reasonable comparisons about the types of research outputs.

6. We quite appreciate these important points made by the reviewer, which we hope would be addressed by future work from India.