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Author’s response to reviews:
Reviewer: Thank you for your resubmission of the above manuscript. Although you have addressed the issues raised by the peer reviewers, some further revisions are required - outlined below.
Response: Thank you for your valued feedback and suggestions. Please see below for our responses to each comment.

Reviewer: In the methods section, please provide some description of the numbers of policy and practice partners with whom you had conversations as part of the scoping of enquiries, and the types of organisations they were based in.
Response: We have added details in the methods section on the number of policy and practice partners who we scoped enquiries with, specified by type of organisations they work for and the type of enquiries they were interested in - pages 5-6, lines 112-119.

Reviewer: Page 12, lines 238-242 please remove the initials in brackets since you do not refer to them again. There’s also a missing comma here on line 239.
Response: We have removed the initials in brackets and reworded the sentence – page 12-13, lines 250-254.

Reviewer: Page 13 lines 258-261 – Confusing (grammatical error?), please rephrase
Response: We have rephrased the sentence to avoid confusing grammar – page 13, lines 271-
Reviewer: Page 14 lines 294-297 - Confusingly written, please rephrase.
Response: We have rephrased the sentence to avoid confusion – page 15, lines 307-310.

Reviewer: Page 15 lines 301-303 – You say “However, by applying Goffman’s dramaturgical perspective to these challenges we have tried to represent them in a new light, which suggests that the challenges can be better understood as differences in performances by academics…” But at this point you haven’t applied the dramaturgical perspective which makes it a perplexing statement – the reader is likely to think, “Did I miss it?”. Perhaps you could rephrase, e.g. “However, we now apply Goffman’s dramaturgical perspective to these challenges which presents them in a new light, suggesting that the challenges can be better understood as differences in performances by academics…”
Response: We have the rephrased the sentence a suggested (thank you) – page 15, lines 315-319.

Reviewer: Lines 306-307 – are you describing how these challenges ARE addressed or how they COULD BE addressed? It seems to be the latter.
Response: We change ‘are’ into ‘could be’, as suggested – page 15, line 321.

Reviewer: Lines 326-327 – “Scientific rigour is not always in the interest of developing an intervention” please make this clearer
Response: We have rephrased this sentence to make it clearer by highlighting a potential clash between lengthy ethical procedures that academic researchers have to follow and the time pressures on health practitioners to start developing an intervention as soon as possible – page 16, lines 339-342.

Reviewer: Line 419 – “We are not so sure about the need to give off false impressions” - can you perhaps make a more scholarly statement about this? It seems that you don’t reject this aspect of Goffman’s characterisation, but that you subscribe to a particular interpretation. Please be clear since this is the framework for the whole paper.
Response: We have rephrased this sentence as suggested to be clearer about our interpretation of Goffman’s characterisation, which emphasises providing different impressions to different audiences – page 20, lines 432-434.

Reviewer: Lines 477-484 – please have another go at writing this paragraph which raises some worrying ethical questions which could be directed at you and your organisation. I think you’re trying to convey the knowledge brokers’ strategic communications between different parties here rather than an attempt to mislead them by withholding information (or evidence?!). Be very precise about the point you are making and which terms you use.
Response: We have rephrased this paragraph to be more precise about our argument that knowledge brokers need to be strategic in their communication with different audiences by over-
communicating some facts and under-communicating others depending on the performance for that audience – page 23, lines 493-501.

Reviewer: Lines 492-493 – grammar problem
Response: We have rephrased this sentence by taking out the grammar problem – page 24, lines 508-509.

Reviewer: Please do one more read-through of the whole manuscript with an eye to your use of tense – it shifts between paragraphs and occasionally within paragraphs in a way that doesn’t always seem intentional.
Response: We have read through the whole manuscript and changed tenses where appropriate for consistency.