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Reviewer’s report:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

Background
• In the literature AI is described as a research method (Grant & Humphries, 2006), however the authors are describing AI as an intervention. It is strongly suggested that the authors consider identifying AI as a method (or research method) that can be used to facilitate the process of KT which is compatible with the PARiHS framework.

• As AI is described in the literature as a research method, it is strongly suggested that the authors refrain from referring to AI as a “KT intervention” or referring to the use of AI in the study as a “AI intervention”. The authors begin to use the terminology on page 12 of “AI intervention sessions”. It is strongly suggested that the authors use the language of “AI sessions” throughout the manuscript when referring to the AI actual (instead of “AI intervention” or “AI intervention sessions”).

Methods
• The authors stated that the study detailed in the manuscript is a part of a larger study. The authors need to provide clarification as to the methods used in the larger study and the study detailed in the manuscript. For example, it is unclear to the reader where the “prospective, repeated measures” methods are used in the study detailed in the manuscript. The authors are cautioned against considering the AI sessions (four three-hour sessions over two weeks with different purposes per Table 1) as “repeated measures”.

Methods - AI Intervention
• Although the authors indicate that the study detailed in the manuscript is part of a larger study “which secondarily explored the beginning effects of AI on pain related outcomes” (page 5), the reader requires an explanation of the rationale (possibly in the Background section) as to why the topic of evidence-based pain assessment documentation was chosen as the topic for the AI process and sessions. Is the reader correct in assuming that pain assessment documentation is an issue/problem that has led to the need for the AI process and sessions, since broad affirmative topic was “what is working well for practicing evidence-based pain management on your unit” (page 6)?
Methods – Data Collection

• There is information is Figure 1 regarding the timing of data collection procedures, however the authors need to refer the reader to Figure 1 under the section “Data Collection”. Also referring to this Figure, the authors are again cautioned to describing the study in detailed in this manuscript as “repeated-measures” as the “AI sessions” are on different topics and interviews only occur at one point in time.

• The authors need to address how participants (n = 12) were chosen to participate in the interviews.

Results

• As previously address above under revisions for “Background”, authors are strongly encouraged to refer to the “AI intervention” with the consistent use of the term “AI sessions” and retain the term “AI process”.

Results – “The democratic nature of AI process” (pg. 11) to “Discussion” (pg 21)

• As stated by the authors, the purpose of the manuscript is to explore the “acceptability, fidelity, and feasibility of using AI to implement pain management evidence” (page 5). However, the authors present results related to the implementation of the action plan which is not consistent with the purpose of the manuscript. The authors are strongly cautioned against discussing results related to the implementation of the action plan in this manuscript which his occurs on pages 11 and 21. However this divergence is extremely apparent on pages 16 to 19 when the authors present results related to the “Fidelity of the AI Intervention”. The authors had previously stated on page 5 that Fidelity does include “nurse participants perceptions of barrier to its implementation” but this should be limited to presentation of results related to the barriers to the implementation of the AI process or AI sessions and not barriers related to the implementation of the action plan.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Methods - Data Collection

• Provide the Interview Guide as a Table or Appendix

Results - Sample Characteristics

• The authors state that “approximately half of the sample reported that they had not attended any pain conference or continuing education since completing their entry level nursing degree” (page 9). Given that half of the sample had greater than 6 years experience, the authors should clarify for the reader their definition of “continuing education” and whether they are truly stating that these nurses have not had any continuing education since completing their entry degree.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS

Background

• Further explanation of how AI is comparable with the PARiHS framework would
strengthen the manuscript.

• Given that multiple definitions of Knowledge Translation (KT) exist, it is suggested that the authors provide a definition for Knowledge Translation.

Study Objectives

• References for the terms “Acceptability”, “Fidelity”, and “Feasibility” would strengthen the manuscript.
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