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Reviewer's report:

I believe that the authors have made a big improvement on the earlier version of their paper. I agree with their choice to let go of the barriers as analytical tool en focus on the CM approach of Kok et al. The paper is easier to read and the research steps taken are easier to follow.

I have however some additional suggestions for the authors which I like them to consider.

1. In the result section alignment efforts are described (AE). However it is not obvious, for me as reader, what the categories imply (for example “consultative structure” or “vertical alignment”). In the discussion part these categories are explained but I think it should be better that the categories are described in the beginning in the theoretical framework section.

2. I believe it would be very helpful if timelines were draw for both knowledge products. In this way it becomes visually clear when, which phases take place at what time. As far as I understand it there are two products and each product has its own formulation, production and extension phase. Subsequently formulation phase is not possible. It is formulation phase 2 which took place in the third year. If you draw a time line readers understand this at a glance. Additionally, the implementation of the first knowledge product is still extension phase 1.

3. The result section is still extensive. The illustration by quotes is nice; however it gives me the feeling that topics are mentioned double. I noticed throughout the text phrases like “as mentioned before”. I know it is difficult but if the authors would critically reflect on this, it would be much appreciated.

Small remarks:

• Page 18; De leeuw et al identifies 7 theoretical models. One of them is institutional re-design.

• Page 19: The front stage/ backstage metaphors are coming from van Egmond et.al.
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