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Reviewer's report:

General
1. This paper draws on a case study to suggest that while current interaction models of knowledge translation highlight the importance of continuous interaction between researchers and stakeholders, these interactions might be more successful for both parties if they are targeted and strategically deployed. These are particularly important, the authors argue, when the results of the study relate to topics high on the public agenda or are alarming, because targeted interactions might bring about alignment between researchers and policy makers' interests.

2. The study adds to emerging evidence showing knowledge translation is underpinned by stakeholders' use of 'concepts', ideas or 'frameworks' rather than a simple translation of research results.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

3. While the authors' discussion of the knowledge translation literature is adequate, the methodological basis upon which their reworking of these models is made is less so. I was not convinced that a single case study could warrant such strong claims about what the authors see as required changes to these models. While the case study highlights hitherto ignored processes of strategic interaction and interest alignment, and while it seems appropriate to conceptualise these dimensions, I would ask the authors to cast such conceptualisations as tentative and hypothetical, in need of further comparative research.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

4. In Page 3, line 21: "and knowledge translation are highly social processes that are more successful". Do the authors mean highly socialised processes? And in that case, is 'social' a variable attribute of human processes?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

5. The abstract's results and conclusion sections are vague and do not serve the paper well. Perhaps something more substantive - about strategic interaction, etc.- could be brought to bear in here to interest potential readers.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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.