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1. In the abstract, it states that the aim of the article is to inform readers in universities… Having read through the entire paper, and while I acknowledge that the experience described was one of transferring university based research, I don't think that it is necessary to limit the readership who might benefit from the reflections. I suggest taking 'university' out of this sentence.

DONE

2. Consider stating the relevant theory that underpinned the reflection in the abstract.

DONE

3. Page 3: line 1 - 7. What is the authors perceived difference between dissemination and transfer? Consider stating this for clarity.

DONE

4. Page 3: line 7 - 12. The sentence appears to be confusing with the use of the possessive pronoun. Instead of "In order to be effective at transitioning their research into another
environment, others, especially outside academia, need to see the usefulness of the research to them for it to subsequently create an impact." As it currently reads, consider changing to "For the effective transitioning of research, others, especially outside academia, need to see the usefulness of the research to them for it to subsequently create an impact."

DONE

5. Page 3: line 44 - 58. It is not clear which of these groups the author belongs to. Maybe be more specific here: "as a researcher, …"

DONE

6. Page 6: line 20 - 24. While from my own research, I agree that this statement is correct. Maybe including one example of a determinant influencing knowledge transfer from another research field might make this statement stronger. There are available studies on knowledge transfer with a focus on education, environmental management or agriculture.

DONE

7. Page 7: line 34. HEI not HE.

DONE

8. Page 8: line 54. I suggest quantifying "very few..." what is the number or proportion that withdraw?

DONE
9. Page 13: line 34 - 36. It appears that this sentence is incomplete and should be joined to the following sentence.

DONE

10. Page 13: line 49 - 53. This sentence gives rise to a question: "how are these influences accurately measured?". A few lines addressing this may be beneficial.

DONE

11. Page 14: line 1. usage/influence, as in bibliometrics?

CLARIFIED

12. The author provided a detailed description of engagement and flexibility was well explained. In addition, the author's description of how impact was conceptualized and measured in the context of this study is good, recognizing the dependence on stakeholders' needs and backing it up with examples. However, there is little or no mention of 'time' in relation to this; i.e. how long did it take for the 'impact' to show. This may be useful to note, especially in the 'Impact' subsection. Also, although 'time' was mentioned sufficiently under The Challenges, some estimates to how long 'the time' it takes or how much time needs to be allocated would make a more convincing case of why time was considered a challenge. DONE

13. The author's differentiation between 'adaptation' from 'transfer/exchange' in the case of this study is well stated. However, I suggest that the author considers one or two papers on 'knowledge translation' (especially using the CIHR definition) and maybe reflect on how this may be different from what is termed 'knowledge adaptation' in the paper. I make this comment while recognizing the proliferation of terminologies for describing 'knowledge transfer' and the challenges this often presents. 1,2,3,4,5

DONE
14. Also, the author may consider including a brief recommendation for an evaluation strategy (from the author's experience) that may increase university researchers' knowledge transfer activities. In summary


INCLUDED


INCLUDED


INCLUDED
Reviewer #2: HRPS-D-17-00023

Transferring Research from a University to the UK National Health Service: The Implications for Impact.

Helen Payne

This Opinion piece is a generally well-written account of a most interesting example where a lead-research, Prof Payne, has shown considerable skill and commitment to engage in a range of relevant activities to achieve impact by promoting the adoption of improved services informed by her research. The piece is also, as claimed, underpinned by relevant theory.

Even though it is an Opinion piece, it would benefit from a number of revisions prior to being accepted in order to expand the recognition of the existing extensive literature, specifically on assessing the impact of health research, and to provide somewhat fuller referencing of some of the claims made for P2W. These points are explained below:

1. Given this is an account of impact being achieved in the NHS, it might be helpful to draw, however briefly, on the extensive review of theoretical and empirical studies assessing the impact of health research that was conducted recently for the NIHR:


INCLUDED
2. Examples taken from these reviews include ones, from the UK and elsewhere, that show a number of points that might be relevant for this Opinion piece. These include:

A) The enormous scope of the current impact assessment approaches. Impact assessment has already covered a very wide range of areas such as policies at national and local levels of the health service. Comments from the Stern review are noted on p. 5 of the Opinion piece, but Stern was not really correct to imply that the REF definition of impact was limited, as HEFCE discreetly pointed out in their comment in their Consultation on the next REF: 'The broadening and deepening [recommended by Stern] included some areas that fell within the definition of impact for REF 2014…' (para 78): http://www.hefce.ac.uk/media/HEFCE,2014/Content/Pubs/2016/201636/HEFCE2016_36.pdf

B) While many studies do show societal impact takes a long time to arise, in some cases, especially where there has been a collaborative approach, it can arise quite rapidly and directly. Therefore, it might be useful to slightly qualify the statement at the bottom of p.4,

and also provide greater balance to the claims in the second half of p.6 that research is rarely used (indeed, a further paper from the above review that was published after the submission of this Opinion piece collates data from 36 studies of the impact of multi-project programmes of health research and shows many projects in some programmes, especially needs led or collaborative ones, report making an impact: http://health-policy-systems.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12961-017-0191-y )
C) It might possibly be relevant to note that the impact of the NIH's Mind Body Interactions and Health Programme in the US (which I realise is not the same as the BodyMind Approach) was assessed using the Payback Framework developed in the UK for the Department of Health's R&D Division. This is covered in the articles in the review by Scott et al (2011) INCLUDED and The Madrillon Group (2011).

2. The text is a little repetitive in places, and some of the repetition could usefully be reduced.

3. In just a few places the sentence construction needs some checking, eg on p.13, DONE the first sentence under the sub-heading 'Impact'; DONE and I'm not sure either the construction of the last sentence of the middle paragraph on p. 8 is correct, DONE or the figure of £11 billion? AMENDED

4. Even though this is an Opinion piece, and references for P2W are given in a couple of places, it would still be helpful to give rather more frequent and specific references for some of the various claims made about P2W. For example, no reference is given for the statement on p.8 'The patient experience surveys report 'good' to 'very good' overall satisfaction levels with the service';ADDED AS A REFERENCE THE ARTICLE IN WHICH THE EVIDENCE IS PROVIDED and there seems to be no specific reference to support any of the claims made on pp10-14. REFERENCES ADDED WHERE RELEVANT

5. Some adjustments would be needed/desirable to meet the requirements of the journal, including: the Abstract should be structured; the final section of the piece should be headed 'Conclusions' (DONE); a list of abbreviations is required (DONE); the author information should be moved to the Declarations section at the end (DONE); and, given the intensely strong relationship between the researcher and the initiatives she is describing, I think it would be appropriate in this instance formally to make some acknowledgement of this in the Conflicts of interests section, even though there is no financial gain and the relationship would almost certainly become obvious to any reader. DONE

All these requirements are set out on the journal's web site: http://health-policy-systems.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/opinion