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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting paper about a focused approach to increase capacity in a burgeoning area of health research.

Background: I would have appreciated a brief overview of the content provided in the course. I recognize this is available in ref 4 but a table outlining the components would have been useful. I am not clear if the program continues to be static or if changes have been made over the course of the delivery in response to changes in needs or literature. This information would be helpful in determining the degree of revision such a course requires and may also speak to one of the goals which was for trainees to use the material provided in the course to train others (are they updated or do they continue to use the same materials?).

Methods: although acceptable, and addressed in the limitations, I thought the methods were quite dependent on the initiating organization. Portfolio analysis and the comparison of presenters at the annual conference may be helpful but I am not clear if other options for determining output independent from the NIH alone might have yielded different results. Some of the measures feel a bit circular. You train in a particular organization with a group of researchers who are affiliated and then you apply to the respective conferences as presenters and granting agencies as reviewers and so on. The surveys provide valuable information but both surveys went out in August which may have limited responses.

Results: I'm not sure Figure 1 is required as it is captured in the narrative.

Discussion:

I felt the authors should have discussed the potential implications of the change in format on the ongoing success given that they identify the engagement and opportunities for collaboration in the face-to-face setting as one of the reasons the results can not be replicated by those who were not accepted into the course.
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