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Reviewer's report:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

The author must respond to these before a decision on publication can be reached. For example, additional necessary experiments or controls, statistical mistakes, errors in interpretation.

None

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

1. The authors use the term ‘knowledge translation’ and provide a definition of that term from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. I would recommend adding some reference to the competing terms used in the field to describe the same process (Knowledge transfer, knowledge mobilization, knowledge exchange) and include at least one other definition.

2. The authors should make even more explicit how the graphical representation of ‘strata’ indicates the importance of the themes that emerged with concept maps. It is tempting to assume that the larger the “shape” in the figures, the more important the theme (as opposed to the more strata in the diagram).

3. On page 5, step 3, the authors write “next, each participant grouped the statements in to categories that were meaningful to him”. Replace “him” with “them”, making the language gender-neutral.

4. Insert paragraph break on page 7 just before “of these four research priorities”.

5. Eliminate the use of “HSS group” and replace with the full term.

6. End of page 10 and beginning of page 11 – incomplete sentence or fragment – “However, [37] show that.... It is unclear what the authors are referring to.

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.
1. It would be interesting if the authors would briefly address the question of whether these findings are likely to be specific to the domain of public health, or if these areas of KT research are deemed by them to be generic in nature. If it is the latter, the conclusions may be of interest to a broader audience than those primarily interested in public health.

2. Opening sentence of main paper on page 3 – “knowledge translation is emerging as a distinct field of research”. I think it would be more accurate to say that the field of research has emerged.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report that will be passed on to the authors.

**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.