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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

I’m pleased to have had the opportunity to review your manuscript “Talk, Trust and Time: A Longitudinal Study Evaluating Knowledge Translation and Exchange Processes for Research on Violence Against Women”, submitted to Implementation Science.

I congratulate you to a very ambitious study in a field where more knowledge is needed, i.e. involvement of stakeholders in knowledge translation. However, there are parts of the manuscript that I suggest would benefit from further development, including the following Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The underpinnings of the study need to be better described. The background is limited, and the audience should have the opportunity to share the theoretical framework of your study.

2. The study design may well be further illuminated. It seems that you have performed a longitudinal cross-sectional study, applying concurrent mixed methods design to collect data. Assure consistency between the design, the aim, and the research questions, and the methods throughout the manuscript. Also, the abstract should correspond to the main paper and the main paper should include all abstract information.

3. Further, phrasing the core sections of the manuscript should be coherent, providing guidance to the audience; i.e. the suggested goal of the project, the aim of the study, and the data methods applied should correspond, if you decide to include all in the text, followed by an explicit structure of the findings. Currently, the manuscript describes that the overall goal of the project was to “ensure that results arising from the research were identified early, and developed appropriately for key audiences”, yet that you “report on the implementation of specific KTE activities over the course of three years”. Nevertheless, you include “the four-year study that identified and documented how stakeholders received, engaged with, and used (or not) the research knowledge” and the following specific research questions:

a. to investigate the effectiveness of specific KTE strategies in the area,

b. to identify factors that influence the uptake, sharing and use of the new knowledge, and,

c. to describe the consequences of sharing research knowledge in a complex,
multi-stakeholder environment and,
d. to collate the “lessons learned” applicable to a broader area.

Then, in the Results section, you present extensive sets of data in the order of Knowledge Dissemination & Uptake, Knowledge Sharing and Use, and Impact. There is no evidence as to why these particular headings and the relation to the later described “key findings”: Talk, Time and Trust. For example, tracing the first research question (i.e. how effective recipients considered KTE strategies in VAW), one initially finds data which shall “identify which strategies were effective”, but rather provides that the respondents appreciated the strategies (section Knowledge dissemination and uptake). Further, data reported in the section Knowledge sharing and Use provides that the knowledge was shared and/or used, but does not shed any light if related to participants’ experience of the effectiveness of the strategies applied in the intervention. In the later section Impact, you suggest data from a limited number of participants to inform the impact of the strategies, a majority reporting that it was “Too soon to tell” at the first data collection and almost as many agreeing or saying no at the second data collection point. The current structure makes it difficult to trace the main results in relation to what you intended with the study, and to value the additional contribution your study may provide in the KTE research area.

4. The intervention and the data collection suggest that aspects of participatory action research have influenced the study and yet, due to the lack of theoretical framework and extended study design, it is not evident. Further, you suggest that there were experiences from much earlier stages, as well as a priori assumptions based on your expertise in the research area informing your data collection. This process should be transparent in order for the audience to appreciate the study report (see also above no. 1 and 2).

5. The data analysis should be described comprehensively; in particular there is a need for a description of how the analysis was performed in terms of preventing bias in the qualitative analysis and assuring analysis transparency.

6. The concluding themes, “key findings”, presented in the Discussion section seem to be main findings. Thus, they should be in the Results section, with an appropriate basis for the forming of these themes (see also transparency of analysis above/issue 5).

7. Apparently, the design applied created a possibility that the findings from the small group discussions represents one, dominant person only, which is also stated by some participants. This issue should be included, clarifying whether the discussions and/or your analysis reached saturation of the perspectives you sought to find within the study and how you have proceeded in the analysis to assure the findings depict the shared perceptions of the participants.

8. As described in the manuscript, your previous study (reference no. 20) formed the basis for the KTE findings to be disseminated through the intervention. However, there have been comments from other researchers, suggesting that your findings may be too limited for the conclusions made. Further, some of the participants in this study had objections to your findings. The manuscript would benefit from a further debate on how this issue was dealt with within your
intervention, and throughout the analysis and discussion of the findings.

9. Please provide the number of participants (n) consistently throughout the Results section when it comes to the quantitative data.

10. A more concise text would improve the paper. In particular, consider decreasing and/or additional ways to present the intervention process in the Methods section, as well as reducing lengthy quotes, excluding aspects not appropriate for the understanding of the categories.

Best of luck with you work on the paper and your further research.

Dr. A C Eldh
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