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Author’s response to reviews:

Revision points and Responses

We have responded to the relevant reviewer’s queries and have highlighted our additions and changes in yellow in the manuscript text. Text that has been removed is crossed out. We have also provided a clean copy. We provide a description below of how each point has been responded to:

Review 1.

1. The title is compelling, but conflicts with the actual findings. Results suggest that people are playing ball to some degree, just not to a sufficient degree. Also the findings include a very important point about silos. What about "It's hard to play ball: A qualitative study of knowledge exchange and silo effects in public health"?

a. Thank you for this suggestion, it is helpful. We really like the change and have revised title as suggested to "It's hard to play ball: A qualitative study of knowledge exchange and silo effects in public health" [title page]

2. Nothing is included in the abstract about analysis procedures. Add a sentence.

a. Thank you for pointing this out. We have now added a sentence about our analysis approach. [abstract]
3. Description of Silos: As a reader I was hoping for a deeper discussion about the persistence of silos. Is there any more information that could be mined from the thematic material for this purpose? Any references that could be made to existing styles of work in public health? Anything from the organizational literature that would add to an understanding of the difficulties experienced in building coalitions?

Thank you for raising these important considerations regarding the description of silos.

a. We have tried to better articulate, describe and discuss silos as beneficial versus problematic in greater depth, and we found your insights very helpful here in structuring our thinking – we have reflected this in the paper within the context of our own study and acknowledge this in the acknowledgements section [pg18, title page]

b. We have extended some examples used in the paper [pgs 14-16] to further illustrate silo-working.

c. We have included discussion on styles of working in public health and how they might relate to silos and their persistence [pg 18]

d. We have added text from organisational studies literature to demonstrate some of the practical problems that people aiming for partnership face. These include economic, organisational and individual psychological issues. [pg 20-21] Further we have aimed to add depth to the discussion in terms of why silos might persist [pg18-19].

4. Questions were derived from RE-AIM. The framework could also be used for contextualizing results in the discussion.

a. Thank you for this comment. Although the RE-AIM framework informed our initial thinking and question development for part one of the study guide, it did not follow through coherently to the results. Part two of the study guide included the unstructured questions of the interviewees experiences, and it is these experiences of the programme as a whole that are the main focus of the paper. RE-AIM did not form the context for the results and discussion. We have added a sentence to page 4 to make this clear to the reader. We therefore do not feel that RE-AIM would add insight or understanding to our results, and we have instead focused on point 3 above in extending the depth of our discussion of silos.
We would like to thank the reviewer for their comments. Unfortunately the voices of the communities affected by the programs was not the intended or stipulated focus of our work. We set out to examine only the views of stakeholders who were involved in the management, delivery and evaluation of the programmes. We do understand that community-based participatory research and community-engaged partnerships are important, and their work informs some of our thinking in this paper. We think it would be an interesting area for future work.