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Reviewer's report:

I really enjoyed reading this paper. As you know, theoretical developments in KT are limited - particularly those that consider context. I really like your taxonomy and this will be used extensively once published. I had a couple of comments/suggestions:

Minor essential revisions
1. I think the background section needs a slightly enhanced definition of KT. I think it's fine for people who have knowledge of KT but it makes a few leaps. I would suggest adding a sentence or two that describe more clearly the purpose and associated outcomes of KT. It might also be worth describing what KT looks like in practice.

The methods sections needs just a little more clarity.
2. How many papers were obtained before you reached 100?
3. Presumably there was a range of different study types identified - were most of these descriptive? Please more clearly articulate your inclusion criteria.
4. How were the cases selected? you have identified a set of criteria but how did you find the cases to match these?
5. You identify 57 potential participants. How did you find these names?
6. Did the same interviewer conduct all of the interviews? Who was the interviewer? If not, would this have had any impact on your findings? probably not as you had an interview guide - but I am wondering if one interviewer was more skilled than another you might be able to get more sophisticated responses etc.

Discretionary revisions
It may be worth noting other theoretical approaches (e.g. diffusion of innovations) and then identifying how this approach differs, the strengths of explanation that it offers.
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