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Reviewer's report:

The article comprises a well written descriptive case study of a research teams’ experience of seeking Research Governance and Management approval for a survey based study in the UK.

It provides a useful window into the experiences of active and experienced researchers, which unfortunately, was largely negative. It highlights the damaging impact of the apparently unwieldy system of research monitoring which will surely resonate with researchers across the UK. As such, for UK based researchers, the paper will be of interest.

However, for members of the international community, the number of acronyms and different groups and committees referred to in the paper may prove to be off-putting. It might be worthwhile the authors writing out some of the acronyms in full to add greater clarity – or perhaps a glossary of terms. In addition, some readers may be unclear regarding what is meant by the ‘constituent nations of the UK’ (p1). This could be clarified on the first page. Also, I was not sure what was meant by the term ‘domiciliary interviews’. The international relevance of the paper could perhaps be strengthened if the authors were able to make some wider comparisons with the literature on Research Governance emanating from America or other European/Scandinavian Nations for example.

The authors could add to the evidence base relating to the implementation of Research Governance by suggesting some solutions to the apparent lack of accountability of those organisations involved in the application of the RG&M processes.

Whilst readers of the article will recognise it’s value, the authors should make a short note justifying the usefulness of a descriptive piece such as this, but also recognise the limitations of a single case study as a means of generalising more widely.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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