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Reviewer’s report:

General
Basically this paper takes a book on knowledge management from the business literature and summarizes the concepts from that book for a medical/health services audience. It specifically deals with the understanding that knowledge is hard to transfer or is "sticky" and why that is. I have not read the underlying book so I am not sure how effectively the authors summarize the book. They use a medical example to illustrate their points. The author being summarized is Szulanski; his concepts overlap to some degree with numerous other authors, some of whom are acknowledged and some of whom are not in the article: Nonaka (Knowledge Creation), EM Rogers (Diffusion of Innovations), NM Dixon (Common Knowledge: How companies thrive by sharing what they know), TH DAvenport and L Prusak (Working Knowledge: how organizations manage what they know), JS Brown and P Duguid (The Social Life of Information), Harvard Business Review on Knowledge Management (1998). Weick on sensemaking in organizations.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
I don't know what to suggest--it would be a big job to turn this into a larger review paper. I guess it could be published as a book review. I am not even sure what to suggest to the authors--It could be either enlarged with other additional concepts from other business authors or cut to be a simple, straightforward book review.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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