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REVIEW

Dr Flavia Senkubuge

General points:
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?

Although the question is generally not new, in Africa issues around Knowledge translation have been paid very little attention. It therefore is a very good topic to discuss and is well defined.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?

The methods section needs clarification.

• On the tool, did you first adapt then develop? If yes then it is adapted and then developed.

• Validity of the tool would require much more than just amendments and clarifications. Here I think it was clarity of the tool that was achieved through amendments.

• What consideration was given to selection bias?

• What was the potential sample size from each school?

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?

• Did you use any statistical packages? e.g for data entry or analysis?

• How was data quality ensured? e.g double data etc.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes, the data is presented well. Under table 1 since most values are rounded to the first decimal point it is suggested that the response rate should be rounded off to the first decimal point e.g. 15/58 Makerere 25.9% instead of 26%.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

A very good write up that flows very well. Again be careful and avoid long sentences and reference appropriately.

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

The title should be revised to: Knowledge Translation and Communication across Schools of Public Health in East and Central Africa, as this is the main thrust of the study.

Please refer to the manuscript for the additional changes in the abstract

7. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes, the manuscript is well written and flows well. There is need to reference some areas unless these are the author’s words (see comments on manuscript). The author also has sentences that need to be shortened as they are too long e.g. Background first sentence paragraph 3 starting with The last decade…

Major Compulsory Revisions

Revision of title

• The title should be revised to: Knowledge Translation and Communication across Schools of Public Health in East and Central Africa, as this is the main thrust of the study.

• What consideration was given to selection bias?

Minor Essential Revisions

• Validity of the tool would require much more than just amendments and clarifications. Here I think it was clarity of the tool that was achieved though amendments

• Under table 1 since most values are rounded to the first decimal point it is suggested that the response rate should be rounded off to the first decimal point e.g. 15/58 Makerere 25.9% instead of 26%

• Be consistent in your rounding off most values are to the first decimal others to the second decimal.

Discretionary Revisions

• The addition of a qualitative component to the results would have improved the discussion and results especially considering that key informant interviews were conducted among the stake holders.

**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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