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Dear Drs. Mittman & Eccles,

Enclosed is our paper, “Drawbacks and benefits associated with inter-organizational collaboration along the discovery—development—delivery continuum: A cancer research network case study.” In responding to the handling editor, we made the following changes:

1. Corrected the spelling of Akaike in the methods section
2. Added a paragraph to the discussion providing recommendations for funders based on the findings of our study

Changes are highlighted in the manuscript. Point-by-point responses to the handling editor concerns are included below.

Thank you and the handling editor for your time and effort. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Jenine K. Harris, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
George Warren Brown School of Social Work
Washington University in St. Louis
314-935-3522 (p)
314-935-3756 (f)
Editor's comments:

1) First, please correct a mis-spelling on Page 10 of the manuscript: the name of the test of fit is "Akaike" not "Aikake".

We corrected this.

2) Second, while there is a brief discussion about implications for funders, this perspective is not addressed carefully in the discussion section. Given that many funders are insisting on cross-organizational collaboration, what implications can they draw from their study that are specific to funding agencies?

We added a paragraph to the end of the discussion with recommendations for funders who require (or encourage) collaborative efforts. Given the drawbacks identified by the researchers in our sample, funders may need to evaluate completed projects to identify examples and best practices for collaborative teams and disseminate these to scientists to aid in project and team development. As evidence eventually accumulates related to benefits and drawbacks of collaborative science, funders may wish to adapt collaboration requirements accordingly.