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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript.

We have made the following changes in response to the reviewers’ helpful comments.

Bonnie Sibbald comments that the Primary Care Amplification Model (PCAM) described in our manuscript has various components that are already operating in various countries. We accept this, and have included her examples in the 3rd paragraph of the conclusion. We have also taken her point ‘beacon’ practices must also be responsive to national regulatory and payment frameworks, and included a statement to this affect on page 9.

Bonnie also comments on the complexity of the debate in the UK surrounding the introduction of polyclinics. In response, we have changed the title to remove mention of polyclinics, and have changed the name to “community clinics” in the 2nd paragraph. We have also attempted to make our comments about the UK reforms more general in this paragraph.

Michael Kochen comments on some inconsistencies in our paper that we have corrected. Specifically, we have removed the statement that we are describing “some early clinical outcomes” on page 5, and on page 12, we have removed the statement “…demonstrates the ability … to harness general-practice led innovation…” and changed it to PCAM “has the potential…” We also stress that its impact on health outcomes is yet to be fully assessed.

Michael states that, in general, he strongly discourages authors to make statements about being unaware of any such models described in the health literature if a full systematic search has not been conducted. We have deleted this comment.

We have also made a few minor editing changes through the manuscript.
We hope that these revisions address the concerns of the reviews, and are satisfactory to the editors.

With kind regards

Dr Deborah Askew
(on behalf of Claire Jackson, Caroline Nicholson and Peter Brooks)