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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this is a well written paper of potential interest to the readership of the audience. I found this paper very interesting and readable. I enjoyed reading the author's reflection on the knowledge transfer experience. I found that key assertions and claims in the paper were well justified; at instances where I had a question such as 'how?' or 'why?', it was addressed in the next sentence or paragraph. An example is Page 10: line 42. I wanted to know more about the relationships that were built. And this was sufficiently covered in the succeeding lines. The reflection also touched on some important aspects of knowledge brokering (especially across different groups), such as Page 12: line 12 - 14 and line 19 - 26, and the sufficiently covered on the challenges of measuring/evaluating knowledge transfer activities and the impact generally.

Below are a few comments that I think the author may address to improve the paper:

1. In the abstract, it states that the aim of the article is to inform readers in universities… Haven 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.

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

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

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, …"

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.

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

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

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

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

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.

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

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.
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