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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit this manuscript. Our responses to the issues raise follow.

1. We require all protocols to be submitted with proof of funding; please provide a copy of the CIHR approval letter.

   CIHR letter of approval attached

2. We note that there are a large number of contributors acknowledged, some of whom appear to be making significant contributions across work streams. With protocols we usually expect the authorship to reflect the applicants of the Foundation Grant submission. Can you confirm that the authors listed were the co-applicants for the grant and that the other contributors were not and are happy with the authorship arrangements presented.

   We have discussed authorship with network members. All project leads have now been added as listed authors. In the list of network members we also identify those listed on the CIHR grant with an asterisk.

3. Regarding formatting, although a protocol for a programme of research we felt that the manuscript be restructured so that the objectives and rationales for each work stream are a core part of the text.
Work stream objectives and rationales have been added to Table 2 prior to presentation of the projects under each work stream.

4. A number of systematic reviews are listed and we would expect an indication that the protocols for these will be prospectively registered with PROSPERO. Where already registered, please provide details.

The reviews are in early stages of planning and have not yet been registered although this is the intent. This is now stated explicitly.

5. Finally, we are aware that there is a very limited evidence base for IKT. You rightly acknowledge this and the abstract indicates that you expect to build the evidence base to determine the effectiveness of IKT. Looking at the work packages however, it is not clear if any of the studies will be evaluating effectiveness or will be of sufficient rigour to do so. You may wish to reflect on this in the discussion and perhaps revisit the aspiration of the abstract.

Thank you for alerting us to your concerns about these issues. Our use of the term effectiveness was unfortunate and we have removed it. The research program will report on the process of partnering and its impacts (perceived and actual (when verifiable data are available) and as implied by the comments, these data are not direct measures of effectiveness of the process. We do believe the individual project study designs for the first wave of projects are appropriately rigorous to meet the study objectives. As we develop the second wave of studies we will be striving to further enhance their methodological quality. We have added a section entitled, “Research Programme Limitations” and softened the conclusion section as suggested.