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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this debate paper. One major issue, which was already pointed out in the invitation letter to review, is the considerable overlap between the submitted manuscript and reference 7. The authors’ argument for seeking publication in Implementation Science is that reference 7 appears in the grey literature and is not easily accessible by the general community. They underline that they have added several authors, updated the overviews of reviews and expanded the sections on knowledge translation to policy makers and consumers and the section on “By whom should research knowledge be transferred?” In general, I buy this argumentation even if I do not clearly see how the relatively limited extension of the paper (compared with ref 7) corresponds to adding three authors.

However, similar to the authors I would like to see this paper published in an open access journal and I think Implementation Science is a very appropriate venue. What I particularly liked was the structure of the paper and the wide perspective on knowledge translation (KT), also including KT strategies focusing on consumers and not only on healthcare practitioners and policy decision-makers. I also liked the proposed definition of KT and to see the updated information on effect size of some common implementation interventions. However, being mainly appreciative I also have one major comment where appropriate measures would add to the value of the paper.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

In the section on effectiveness of professional behaviour change strategies the authors explain that interventions were considered generally effective if two thirds or more of identified studies demonstrated improvements. In Table 3 the reader can see this resulting in that all studied interventions are classified as generally effective. In the column on effect sizes the median improvement is about 4-6% for all interventions except for opinion leaders. In my mind this classification of all interventions as generally effective in combination with rather modest effect sizes is something that deserves a discussion. Overall I found it odd to just leave this section with definitions and descriptions of the interventions and the information provided in Table 3. The results are interesting and create several questions. I would like to see a discussion of the findings and some suggested implications of the results. For example, does this similarity in effect sizes indicate that it does not matter what intervention you choose as they all have (almost) the same effect? Or, phrased in a different way, the choice of intervention could be dependent on several factors but not on expected success of the intervention as
the interventions have (almost) the same effect? A more in depth discussion on the impact of knowledge translation interventions focusing on professionals would improve the paper and could either be located in the current section or in the final section on “With what effect should research knowledge be transferred?”

- Minor Essential Revisions
  None

- Discretionary Revisions
  None

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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