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Dear David Moher, Paul Shekelle, and Lesley Stewart,

It is with pleasure that we resubmit “A Protocol for a Systematic Review of the Use of Process Evaluations in Knowledge Translation Research” for publication consideration in Systematic Reviews. We believe that this study will be of great interest to your readership given that there are no methodological guides for designing or executing process evaluations alongside the implementation of knowledge translation research. This study focuses on improving process evaluations by synthesizing current evidence on process evaluations conducted alongside experimental designs for evaluating knowledge translation interventions. Thus, providing the information needed to develop concrete recommendations for knowledge users designing future knowledge translation process evaluations.

This research has received external funding from CIHR and has been peer-reviewed. Proof of this funding has been sent to Rebecca Kirk, the Editorial Office Manager, at Biomed Central. The authors declare that have no competing interests.

We have addressed your requested changes to the manuscript, and highlighted our changes in yellow.

Editorial requests:

- Declarations and abbreviations have been moved
- We have reviewed the abstract as requested and found that the word limit was already under 340 words at 313 words. We do not report results or conclusions in our Abstract because it is a protocol. Instead, we are requesting you let us keep the Significance heading to allow for a summary statement regarding the purpose of the study.
- We did not register with PROSPERO, and therefore cannot provide a number.
- We have merged the summary section with the body of the protocol
- Specific author contributions have been included

Reviewer’s requests:

- We have not and will not be registering this study with the PROSPERO database.
- Wording has been changed – “will be independently screened by two reviewers” was added.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding our submission. Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to Shannon D. Scott, 3rd floor Edmonton Clinic Health Academy, Faculty of Nursing, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6G 1C9.

Most sincerely,
Shannon D. Scott, RN, PhD
Associate Professor, Faculty of Nursing, University of Alberta
CIHR New Investigator & Population Health Investigator, Alberta Heritage Foundation for
Medical Research (AHFMR)