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Reviewer's report:

Discretionary Revisions

Please note that I do not have access to the EBSCO database interface so cannot comment fully on how the search strategies as described could be put into operation. Nevertheless, can still comment on the overall approach

The choice of databases was appropriate and was supplemented by a handsearch of the Implementation Science journal.

MEDLINE search

All of the search statements have been restricted to the abstract field. Not clear why the title field hasn’t also been searched; I would have expected this to be an equally useful field.

Although MeSH does contain relevant terms (e.g. questionnaires) none of the search statements have utilised this facility

Neither has any of the search statements made use of either truncation or adjacency (e.g. using the phrase “diffus$ adj2 innovations” would have identified many more records and increased the overall sensitivity of the search).

Limiting to “health” in the abstract field is unlikely to identify all potentially relevant records as there will be many instances where reference is made to the specific clinical topic or area of medicine rather than “health” e.g. dentistry, paediatrics, oncology, renal medicine, surgery etc etc

PsycINFO search

The search conducted in PsycINFO was restricted to the Tests and Measures field (labelled TM) where tests named in the paper are listed.

This approach may have unexpected outcomes however. For example, when a search for “diffusion of innovation” in the TM field is executed the search engine identifies records that include the single word “Diffusion” and not the phrase as specified. So records that describe or refer to the “Career Decision Scale-Identity Diffusion Subscale” are identified.

Similarly, searching for “knowledge to action”, “knowledge transfer”, or
“knowledge translation” in the TM field identifies records where the one word “knowledge” is part of the test/measure’s name e.g. Number Knowledge Task, Affect Knowledge Test, Infant Feeding Knowledge Test-Form A, Multicultural Awareness-Knowledge- Skills Survey, Metapragnatic Knowledge Test. None of these seem to be of relevance to the project being undertaken.

It would have perhaps been preferable to have widened the search to include other fields within the record, especially as “knowledge translation” is used as a key concept and “knowledge transfer” is used as a subject heading.

In addition, not all records in the database include the TM field so perhaps it’s an overly restrictive approach. For example, a paper with title “Knowledge translation in cancer services: Implementing the Research and Evidence in Practice model” sounds potentially relevant but there is no TM field in this record although the key concepts include “knowledge translation” and the subject heading “knowledge transfer”.
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