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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports on the findings of a study to gather the opinions of experts on some of the barriers and opportunities in the translation of new media research to health promotion practice in Australia. Qualitative analysis so transcripts of interviews with experts identified the main themes: mismatch in aims and priorities, resource and time constraints, and skills for translating new media interventions. These themes accord with previously published work. The authors claim that the main addition that this study brings to the literature is to highlight barriers more specifically related to new media research.

The main area that the authors could address before publication is generalisability of findings beyond Australia. What was the rationale for the study to focus exclusively on the translation of new media research to health promotion practice in Australia? Are there contextual factors that make Australia unique, or was the focus a methodological constraint e.g. access to experts? Were the research experts based in Australia? It is stated in the manuscript that the health promotion experts were, but this is not stated for the researchers. Resource constraints, especially in an unfunded study such as this, are reasonable justification for a specific focus, however, the authors could still address issues of generalisability, both of their findings to other areas, but also whether or not other studies have address the translation of new media research to health promotion practice, as the focus of the introduction does appear to be limited to Australia (e.g. the statement "There are relatively few Australian publications (in either grey or academic literature) that describe new media interventions...").

The three themes identified are justified, but very broad. Given the the author's claimed main contribution of this study is the emphasis on new media research, and within that the rapid pace of developments in the technology, this doesn't come across very strongly from the experts. Indeed I could only find one reference to this from researcher expert although in the manuscript it is reported that researchers reported that "obsolescence as a recurrent threat". If this was a factor that was reported by more than one expert, can the authors provide more evidence, and does this sub-theme fit well within 'Mismatch in aims and priorities' or could the pace of technological change be themed differently to underline the unique contribution of this study?
Minor comments.

Conventionally, quotes from research participants would be presented within quotation marks.

There are one or two minor spelling errors that need correcting in the final proof e.g. page 14 line 377.
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