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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

It appears that the body of evidence on evidence-informed public health and evidence-informed decision-making has not been acknowledged. ‘Evidence-based public health’ is not a contemporary term due to the range of pressures upon practitioners/providers/policymakers to use evidence in decision-making about interventions. This is a separate (although related) concept to applicability and transferability – for which a body of literature also exists. Please review the existing applicability and transferability tools and their literature (some published, some grey literature) and defend how the proposed tool builds upon that work. Examples – L Rychetnik and M Frommer, R Brownson et al, Wang et al, R Armstrong et al. Much of this literature is in BMC implementation science and BMC public health, so this article would need to be very clear about what it contributes.

Further, there is evidence available to show that simply disseminating another tool will not change practice (LaRocca et al 2012). How will it be disseminated in a targeted way to “help” practitioners and researchers, as this article purports? This needs to go beyond ‘knowledge transfer’, as this method is generally ineffective.

Discussion needs to be clearer using literature to defend why this tool would advance the development of evidence-informed health promotion.

Limitations are not mentioned – there is insufficient reason to exclude based on publication language – this can introduce considerable bias. How was risk of bias assessed when reviewing background literature?

Minor essential

The methods are obscure and require clarification e.g. why was a Delphi process not appropriate?

Describe the roles of the ‘expert’ group members to be clear that practitioners were key as well as academics/researchers. Explain the sampling for the group – seems to be convenience sampling – but this needs to be explained e.g. why individuals from only two countries were chosen. Pleased to see that they tool was tested by practitioners – but how is the tool itself transferable/generalisable to other practitioner contexts (other than France/Canada)?
Discretionary

Check language throughout - perhaps seek advice from an English-speaking colleague to check flow and use of words?

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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