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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting approach to examining the uptake of evidence into practice that uses a multipronged approach. Whilst this is a strength of the manuscript it is also a weakness in that it is overly complicated and difficult to untangle. I hope the authors will be able to restructure it to facilitate reading and understanding. It was not always clear to what extent the aim was being adhered to: "evaluate the impact of a falls prevention community of practice on translating falls prevention evidence into practice". It seemed that a significant amount of the work was presenting important information relating to context and culture, but not always about translating into practice.

My main comment is that if the clarity and organisation of the MS were improved it provides an interesting an important perspective.

Methods:

The design is complex and as such is tricky to clearly describe. There are many acronyms, some that are quite similar, is it possible to reduce the number. It is not clear how facilities were selected for participation. It needs to be clearer who the participants are at the different levels, it is a little confusing. What were the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the different levels of participants? How were participants at the different levels sampled? Were falls reports considered as a level of evidence of impact? If not why not?

Why is vitamin D supplementation level chosen as the important variable when falls may be a more important factor in RAC?

Were interviews audio recorded? It is not clearly mentioned.

L116: the "(mechanisms)" is confusing and doesn't help the reader. Suggest removing.

L130: add in sd around the mean age.

L162: spreadsheet not spread sheet
L174: care staff not staffs

L205: many readers are unfamiliar with SNA, including myself, a little more explanation of why this is a useful analysis and what it tells you, would help the reader.

L216: more justification of using frequency counts of qualitative data is needed.

L223: clarify how using a design guideline helps and what is the behaviour change wheel?

Figure 1 was not available for me to view. This will need further checking.

Results:

The results were similarly difficult to untangle and I spent quite a lot of time attempting to do so. Maybe restructuring and better signposting would help. It isn't terribly helpful to report % when there is such a low number (ie L270 "…interviewed six members (33.3%)…").

L258: it is not clear how 'correct' responses were determined. Was it well described in the method?

Figure 2: I don't think this is needed.

L290: if only 3 posts were initiated by members who initiated the others? If it wasn't the members is the number of discussions then a good reflection of connectedness?

Figure 3: I am not sure the figure helps, the text is clear enough

L322: the response rate of 38% is low - any comment?

Discussion

L442: was there enough sharing and collaborating to support professional identity building?

L479: "At [an] organisational level…" insert "an"

L498: perhaps putting this earlier might help the reader avoid wondering why falls were not the outcome of interest.
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