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Reviewer's report:

Overall, the article is very well written and I found it interesting to read as I am involved in planning conferences and other KT events. I appreciate the changes that the authors made based on the last reviewer's feedback and think that the recommendations they've included for others planning larger-scale events will be useful.

The background section is excellent, and provides a good overview of the conference and its goals as well as the approach to the evaluation. However, I felt that some of the information that is contained in the supplementary file 1 would have been helpful in the main journal article. Perhaps that was a decision made due to word limits, but if you have the space to integrate some description of the interactive conference formats into the background section it would be helpful as readers may/may not look at supplementary files (e.g., what is a working table? How did you make panels more interactive?). Given that one of your findings is that the interactive nature of the panels and working tables was a strength of the conference, I think it's important to describe what that looked like in the journal article itself. Otherwise, it might be difficult for readers to understand why people found those sessions so useful/how they might adopt/adapt that format for their own KT events.
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