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Reviewer's report:

The topic of this paper is in itself very interesting. Research utilization in ph or health promotion policy is very important and much more difficult to achieve as the traditional academic worlds thinks it is. Papers that try to find out which ways of research translation (into policy) do seem to be effective therefore are of great importance. Murray's theory appears very attractive to apply in this domain. The introduction of this paper I see as showing the potential of turning this into a valuable paper.

Having said this however, I do feel that this paper the way this is done (either in the study or in the way of reporting it, I can only judge the last of course) does not meet standards of acceptable academic research reporting. Theory, hypothesis and reporting findings, discussing findings and drawing conclusion are not clearly distinguished. The central aims and question of the paper are mentioned several times in very different wordings-also in places as under "data analysis" where they do not belong at all. So it remains unclear what exactly is the central aims and question to be answered in this paper. Theoretical notions differ throughout the paper and are not clearly stated (in one place) as underpinning the hypothesis of the paper.

Methods are not clearly described: lots of sentences with overlap are there, but not what the essential topics of the interviews where, how the coding process was done, was coding done by more than 1 researcher, was the inter coder reliability tested, was software used, which software, how many interviews were held (over 200 participants? were all of them interviewed. How where the three cases selected, what where the characteristics by which they were seen as being representative to one of the three approaches in Murray's theory? Sizes of the cases differ very much?

In the discussion it is mentioned (393-394) that the cases all were successful in research translation-how was this measured, and it was not part of the aim of the study either? In line 410-412 it seems that another assumption is made? In line 497-500 is this the opinion of the authors (governance fails to be taken on in Murrays model) which they already started with in the introduction and is now self-confirmed?
This study may have been carried out in a thorough academic way, however the reporting of it does not state this. On the contrary they way it is written presents it as a subjective description of the opinion of authors on how research translation could be more effectively organized. And I may agree with them, but I am certainly not convinced by the findings they report.
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