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Reviewer’s report:

Major compulsory revisions

1. One of the main conclusions is that being member of the core of the network is associated with knowledge mobilization. On the same time, 97% of these core members are staff member as well. It might be possible that the effect of core membership is just a confounder of the effect of being a staff member. A multivariate analysis could solve this problem and is strongly suggested.

2. Missing values: Only 86 out of 71+278=349 network members answered the questionnaire. Moreover, only 34 out of 278 volunteers responded. This is a serious number of missing respondents and can have implications for the analysis and outcomes, especially in SNA. How did the authors deal with this issue and what are the implications for the results? For example, if a volunteer is in a network with other volunteers, but the others are missing in the analysis, you might come to wrong conclusions.

Minor compulsory revisions

3. 97% Of the individuals in the core is staff member. On the other hand, the authors state that being volunteer or staff is not related to membership of the core or periphery. This looks highly unlikely to me if 97% of the individuals in the core is staff member.

4. How is defined whether one is member of the core or periphery?

Discretionary revisions

5. In the first paragraph of the background, the authors state that "few studies have acknowledged or examined the complex process of mobilizing research evidence", but in the next paragraph, they write "Diffusion of innovations theory
has been widely used by researchers to understand the mobilization of research findings in health care and public health settings”. Although I do appreciate that the authors show evidence for both statements, this section confuses me.
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