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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

The title of the article leads the reader to expect an explanation of what the core competencies are. The closest the article comes to detailing these is figure 1, but I don't think that's the list the authors are hoping the participants acquire. At any rate, the competencies should be listed in the article, and I think it would be useful to have a table that describes the didactic and experiential learning techniques that will be used to impart each.

Also, how is this funded? Who will need to fund this to have it reach a broad, wide audience?

Minor essential revisions.

It is probably not my place to suggest an alternative evaluation strategy, but the plan they've described seems unlikely to convince those who need to be convinced to invest in the training for themselves or their employees.

The plan that's laid out will explore an important element, whether participants participate and whether they think it was worth their while, but at a minimum, I'd have the participants' colleagues surveyed to see if they see the KT skills being applied and/or affecting knowledge uptake. I'd look for ways to objectively measure impact of the training. I know this is hard. RWJF is experiencing similar challenges evaluating 5QI training initiatives across the country.

Discretionary revisions

Include some actual experiences or self report of how those who have undergone the program have used it in their work.
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