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Reviewer's report:

This paper is very clearly written and provides a summary of how a workshop was conducted for NIH researchers. It is somewhat unusual to see the write up of a workshop published. However, as demonstrated in this paper there is much to be learnt to run workshops well.

Would it be useful to publish any of the workshop tools you describe? Or provide a link to where they can be obtained?

Minor comments:

Some of the terminology will not be familiar to those outside the NIH / UA. You describe what program scientists etc are nicely in the introduction, but on reading the abstract it was unclear to me who your target audience was.

You use the term extramural investigators and I am not sure what you mean by this. Could you add a table describing the participants (just simple summary stats) and their responses.

There is a lot of focus on the PRECIS tool. To the extent that the paper even feels a little like an advertisement. You have a very nice opening introduction where you describe pragmatic trials, could you consider adding how the PRECIS fits into all this? So, when exactly should a researcher be using this tool? At the design stage, reporting? Specifically one of the reviews is critical of not including the PRECIS tool, but to me it is unclear exactly when and why it should be used. (I apologize if this is obvious to the authors, but I don’t think it will be to your intended readership)
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