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Reviewer's report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS
Group and Individual interviews, paragraph 4: The difference between the seven interviews conducted and the six which where tape recorded needs to be made clear. Are they both individual interviews or group interviews?
Group and Individual interviews, paragraph 4: In group interviews, some groups had 2 participants. I think two is too small a number to use for group interviews. Let it be supported by a reference if it is alright to interview a group of two. If there is no reference to support the use of two participants in a group, let it be included as one of the limitations of the study.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS
Clarify how each limitation affects the interpretation of the findings. E.G. What value could collecting information from ‘doers’ have added to the study?

DISCUSSION
The discussion of key findings should be done in light of previous research studies. I suggest merging the ‘discussion’ section with the section on ‘findings in relation to previous studies’ so that each key finding is discussed in light

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS
Methods 3rd paragraph: Web links in the text should be substituted with correct referencing
Framework for assessing knowledge translation platforms, 1st sentence: Belongs to data analysis section
Data Analysis, 2nd paragraph: Clarify the meaning of ‘holistically analysed’ in this study

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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