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Professor Susan Michie
Associate Editor
Implementation Science

RE: Knowledge Translation of Research Findings (MS: 9366286826269645)

Dear Professor Michie:

Thank you for the opportunity to further revise our manuscript. We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewers. The comments, along with our response and reference to where it is addressed in the revised manuscript, are summarized in the attached table.

If you require further clarification please do not hesitate to contact me.

We look forward to your response.

Yours sincerely,

Jeremy M. Grimshaw MBChB, PhD
Senior Scientist
Clinical Epidemiology Program
Ottawa Hospital Research Institute

cc
Martin P. Eccles
John N. Lavis
Sophie J. Hill
Janet E. Squires
## Details of Revisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Revision</th>
<th>Details of revision requested</th>
<th>How addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Reviewer 1: Lars Wallin | **Discretionary Revisions**  
The manuscript has been substantially improved through the changes and additions made. I think it could be published as it stands. There is however one thing that came up by reading the paper again. The authors make a central statement in claiming that the choice of knowledge translation strategy should be informed by an assessment of the likely barriers and facilitators. I think this statement could be supported by referring to the Cochrane review on tailored interventions (1). This review might fit well in Table 3 and used in the “How should research knowledge be transferred?” section. But I leave this as a suggestion for the authors to decide upon. | We have added this review to our discussion in two places:  
(1) We have added a new paragraph titled ‘tailored interventions’ under the section ‘Effectiveness of professional behaviour change strategies’ (see highlighted section on pages 19-20).  
(2) We have added the review to Table 3 (see page 35) |
| Reviewer 2: Paul Glasziou | **Minor Comments**  
There are no changes in abstract. It should at least say "the basic unit of knowledge translation should USUALLY be systematic reviews". But since abstracts are much more widely read than papers, the authors might consider whether other changes are worthwhile following the revisions.  
Figure 1. Though quoted from elsewhere adding the horizontal line makes it more readable. The Figure legend should give the reference and say "modified from" | We have made the requested change as well as the addition of a further clarifying statement to the abstract (see highlighted changes to the abstract, page 2)  
We have made this revision. We have added the previously requested grid line at 0% and have added the reference with the ‘modified from’ statement suggested. |