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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Martin

Again we are most grateful to the reviewers for their helpful comments which have further strengthened this article. We have incorporated nearly all their suggestions.

Reviewer One:
We have added the data on the denominator for the email surveys.
P7: We have added the response rates for the interviews, but have done so in the Methods section as there were several points we thought we should explain including the fact that resources did not allow us to approach all members of the Advisory Group for an interview.
P8: the response rate to the email surveys has now been stated, showing just how low it was.
P10: see above for why we have now included the interview response rate in the methods.
P17: we agree the sentence could have been better phrased, but have amended it in a slightly different way.
P18: we have clarified the point by replacing brief with remit.
P19: we acknowledge the point about it being desirable to add some qualification to the points about the IMP shaping the debate and so have added 'especially in the UK'.
P19: the duplicated 'was' has been deleted.

Reviewer Two:
We have added some comments in the sections on setting and developing priorities - in both the findings and discussion - about why no research was funded in some priority areas. We have also added some further comments in the sections on interaction with/support for applicants, again in both the findings and discussion.
In the results section on publications we have clarified how we were able to obtain some data about the 6 projects for which no questionnaire was completed.
We have also clarified in the text in results that the data from tables 3 and 4 do indeed come from the 30 completed questionnaires.
We have corrected the Coulter reference.