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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Better alignment of the content with the title as noted by another reviewer.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   OK. You state in your rebuttal that it is a "mixed methods" approach, but you state this nowhere in the text. It appears to be primarily a survey. The subject matter reviewed for the thematic analysis is not clear (not documented). This appears to have been a structured discussion among a rarefied group of leaders and in this case, interviews with quotes usually lends credence to qualitative analysis.

3. Are the data sound?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   See #2 (On what was the thematic analysis based? Unclear).

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   For the thematic analysis, no.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   See no. 2-4 above.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Now.

9. Is the writing level acceptable?
   Yes

I believe that this is an important topic and article. The authors are known in the field of informatics. I think that a number of improvements have been made in
response to the reviewer comments. Still, there is a big hole of what was reviewed for the thematic analysis. I don't see it and selection of the material reviewed can clearly influence what is presented as the "result". Even the qualitative results of structured interviews of leaders in the field would be helpful to gain an insight as to how this fits into other aspects of translational science.

Does development of the technologies described form its own version of T1 knowledge translation (as described by Woolf) or is it part of the implementation T2 stage of KT or both? And how do the diagrams fit with other models of CTS/KT? (since these areas are going through their own conceptual leadership struggles).

I support the ideas in this document and believe these are more organizational and policy issues than research questions per se, since the institutions described are heterogeneous.

For this article:

Major compulsory: 1) There is still the weakness of the qualitative analysis. WHAT is being studied? Unclear yet you state there is a discordance. Was there discussion of any sort with leadership of the different institutions? White papers? Academic forums? This discussion did not spring from nowhere.

Major compulsory: 2) Reflect this in your writing. Your abstract leaves out some of this.

Minor but important: 3) Where does money fit into this discussion? It shapes power structures and thereby the relationships you are studying.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.