Reviewer's report

Title: Talk, Trust and Time: A Longitudinal Study Evaluating Knowledge Translation and Exchange Processes for Research on Violence Against Women

Version: 3 Date: 28 June 2011

Reviewer: Janet Curran

Reviewer's report:

Title: Talk, Trust and Time: A Longitudinal Study Evaluating Knowledge Translation and Exchange Processes for Research on Violence Against Women

Authors: C. Nadine Wathen
Shannon Sibbald
Susan Jack
Harriet MacMillan

Date: June 27, 2011

Reviewer: Janet Curran

Reviewer’s Report

Thank you for the opportunity to re-read this manuscript. I appreciate the time and effort the authors have made to respond to the reviewer’s comments on this complex manuscript. I think that many of the revisions that have been made in response to reviewer’s comments do improve the organization and flow of the manuscript from the previous version. However, a number of concerns remain regarding 1. insufficient information in the background to outline the problem and 2. presentation and organization of key findings, particularly as they relate to Research Question 2. I think these concerns, if left unattended, will limit the usefulness of your study findings to readers.

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.
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.

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.

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
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