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11 July 2011

The Editors,

*Implementation Science*


Thank you again to all four reviewers for their helpful comments on the above-named manuscript, which we resubmit for consideration in *Implementation Science*.

We have attached a document outlining our responses to each of the reviewers’ points, and indicated these changes in the text using grey highlight. There were some changes to Additional file 1 (also resubmitted) but no changes to Additional file 2, the Figure or the Tables.

Thank you again for considering this work.

Sincerely, and on behalf of my co-authors,

C. Nadine Wathen, PhD
Associate Professor
nwathen@uwo.ca
tel: 519.661.2111 x88480

C. Nadine Wathen, PhD
Associate Professor
nwathen@uwo.ca
tel: 519.661.2111 x88480
Response to Reviewers – Revision 2

Reviewer 1 (Ann Catrine Eldh):

1. Section Methods, page 7, you provide the number of participants, in accordance with suggestions from me and reviewer 3. However, revise as suggested, i.e. provide "n" for sample, rather than "N" (suggested as your population, described on page 12, section Results).

Corrected in the text and Tables. Since it is hard to know what our true “population” was (all potential VAW stakeholders? All those we were aware of?), we have not tried to stipulate this explicitly, and therefore have stuck with the sample notation of “n” throughout (even for sub-samples, as in the tables).

2. Section Results, page 12, line 15: exclude your reflection regarding what is interesting, which is rather for the Discussion section.

Done.

3. Section Discussion, Limitations and lessons learned, page 29, line 10: Provide examples of the literature you suggest is most important when it comes to consistency with your findings.

We have added specific examples of these factors and cited a few key papers in support.

Reviewer 2 (Joyce Wilkinson):

One typographical error on page 12 (...thus while there was minimal overall between the samples...) that needs attention.

Fixed.

Reviewer 3 (Neale Smith):

Top of page 6: I believe the types of KTE use should be defined as “conceptual/enlightenment” and “symbolic/selective”?

Yes, thanks. Corrected.

Top of page 22: Authors state that “Only four people answered this question, indicating that the majority had not yet encountered any impact …” –I think this is more like a presumption

We have removed this part of the sentence – the issue of interpreting findings re: timing to assess use/impact is left to the Discussion.
Page 24, middle: Authors state that “Participants also had many good suggestions…” –While I don’t necessarily disagree, ‘good’ is a normative claim yet to be demonstrated

Removed “good”.

Reviewer 4 (Janet Curran)

Minor Essential Revisions
1. There appears to be a disconnect between the framework used to organize the study findings and the specific research questions which guided the study. In particular, the framework fails to provide a useful strategy to address the second research question (What factors influence the uptake, sharing and use of new knowledge). These factors are not clearly described in the results or the discussion sections of the paper. I think the answer to this question will be of great (and in some cases, most) interest to your target audience for this paper. However, they will have great difficulty identifying these factors in your manuscript. In addition, it is not clear how “impact” as you describe it, is connected to the research questions.

We have added a section on page 32 that summarizes the key findings and specifically addresses Research Question 2; as suggested below (point #2), this utilizes the framework of Oh & Rich cited in the Introduction. We also believe that it presents the key messages/highlights of key findings that the Reviewer suggests in point #3, below.

Discretionary Revisions
1. I think the background section would benefit from the addition of further detail. Many readers will be unfamiliar with the McMaster Violence Against Women Research Program and as such may have trouble moving directly into description of the KTE process. I think it would help situate the KTE strategies and the participants responses if you presented some of the key findings from your research program in the background section of the paper.

We seek guidance from the Associate Editor on this issue – we are happy to provide additional detail about the overall research program, including a list of projects and publications. However, we feel that the Key Messages articulated in Additional File 1, along with our brief description in the text and the Figure, strike a balance between knowing enough about the context to understand our approach to KTE, and, on the other hand, too much detail (and text length) spent describing the research program. As a middle ground, we have added, at the end of Additional File 1 – the list of projects and related publications.

2. In the newly added section on Approach to KTE,(p 5) the authors discuss mediating factors of knowledge utilization as outlined Oh & Rich. This would have been helpful to tie back into the discussion section and may have addressed the concerns regarding the lack of clarity addressing research question 2 outlined in the first point of the previous section above.

See above

3. The key take-home messages or important findings are still not clear. Some of the important points raised in the conclusion were not fully explored in the body of the paper, particular the influence of context.

See above