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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

General
1. This paper is very confusing to read. I think the authors need to reconsider what they are trying to convey. The title suggests they are presenting a logic model. However, they actually describe the development and implementation of an intervention. The logic model underpinning this is only briefly alluded to. If this is indeed the main focus of the paper, then they should include: more details of how they developed the logic model, including how the results/findings of “preliminary studies” were used to develop it; explanation of the logic model itself (and – if you like - how it informed intervention design). If you want to write a paper about the overall process of developing and implementing a KT intervention (of which the logic model is only one stage in a long process), then please change the title/aims to reflect this.

Abstract
2. The methods are not clear. I believe this stems from the lack of focus, as per previous comment. You should state upfront that this paper reports on the methods used to develop a KT intervention.

Methods
3. I find the structure of this paper confusing. Why are the findings of the “preliminary studies” reported in the methods? If they are to remain here, then this needs to be explained.

Minor Essential Revisions

General
1. The authors have a tendency for over-complicated (and over-long) sentence construction and imprecise use of language. Improved accuracy would render this paper much more readable.

2. Please be consistent in your use of terminology – eg, scoping review, literature review, systematic review, etc. The same goes for the words used to describe the intervention(s)/program.

Abstract
3. The results are repetitive, could be edited.
Background

4. Last sentence of first paragraph - references are needed to support all statements on the benefits of EIDM.

5. Third paragraph, second sentence – missing “of”.

6. 5th paragraph, first sentence – what “proposal” are the authors referring to? Is this where they justify their study? Need rewording. “LG” needs writing in full at first use.

7. 5th paragraph, 6th sentence – “The purpose of this paper is to describe the development and content of the intervention”? I thought the purpose was to describe the theory of change underpinning it – the logic model. This goes back to my main concern – the authors need to be clearer on what the paper is actually about.

8. In the final paragraph the authors state that “The purpose of this paper is to describe the process for the design of a logic model to underpin a KT intervention....” This is different to the purpose previously stated (see number 7, above).

Methods – Study 1a

9. All the sources listed are electronic databases, apart from Google and Google Scholar. PubMed and MEDLINE are basically the same database. The authors do not need to search both. Please specify which databases provided by WoS were accessed (SSCI, SCI, etc).

10. Please see PRISMA for how to report systematic review methods. An example search strategy should normally be included as an appendix.

11. First paragraph, 2nd sentence - I don’t understand why reference 5 is required?

12. Second paragraph, 1st sentence – please reword for clarity “draws from a greater amount of research”.

13. Some of the findings reported in this section appear to relate to barriers to EIDM. However, this was not a stated aim of the review. This was in fact “To understand the types of KT strategies and theoretical perspectives ...” Either the findings need to be removed, or the aims need editing.

14. The sentences on “instrumental use” are very unclear. What point are the authors trying to make?

Methods – Study 1b

15. This is a systematic review. Where are the methods of the review? They should be described as in Study 1a.

16. First paragraph, 4th sentence - there is a space missing before “108”.

Methods – Study 2

17. What is EviDenT? It has not been mentioned until now. Where does it fit in? How does it relate to KT4LG? Why is it being described under the survey methods section? The authors should be describing the survey here. In fact, no
methods for the survey are reported, just the number of respondents and the response rate.

18. In the last paragraph the authors introduce another acronym “EvDM”. What is this?

Methods - Study 3

19. First paragraph, 3rd sentence – please correct bad grammar.

Discussion

20. First paragraph, 1st sentence – “identify” should be “identifies”

21. First sentence under “Intervention aims” - needs to be consistent with rest of paper in reference to the “preliminary studies”. Name them precisely.

22. What is “health.evidence.ca”? 

23. Who are “Program Coordinators”?

24. Clearer signposting is needed under “Intervention implementation”. The authors should first state how many components the intervention comprises, and then describe each in turn

25. Why do the authors suddenly switch away from narrative, eg “Content and approach:...”? Should this structured text be in a table/box?

26. Last sentence under “Research symposium” – missing “by the”. I also do not follow the statement “more resource intensive for participants”. Vague language. Do the authors mean “too time-consuming”?

27. Second sentence under “Evidence Summaries” has extra full stop.

Conclusions

28. First paragraph, 2nd sentence makes same point twice – edit.

29. First paragraph, 2nd sentence “including” should read “included”.

30. Some very over-long (imprecise) sentences – particularly sentence 3.

31. Missing space after sentence 3.

32. First paragraph, 5th sentence, missing “was”. Also what are the authors referring to with the word “program”?

33. First sentence of last paragraph does not make sense. What point are the authors trying to make?

Discretionary Revisions

General

1. Clearer signposting in this manuscript would help throughout. It is reporting on a complex series of interlinking studies. The relationships among these studies are not made clear by the authors.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being
published

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