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Reviewer's report:

I thought this paper was very good. It is well written, concise and informative. As someone who works in knowledge brokering and knowledge translation, I also feel that it has good evidence and insights to the challenges and processes of the work. My comments on the paper are few.

The discussion would benefit from consistent explicit linking of the 5 themes developed in the findings to the dramaturgical lens of Goffman, as is done for findings 1 to 3 (Managing performances in knowledge brokering; Performing for different audiences; When audience segregation fails). After that, beginning with the sub-heading The backstage function of AskFuse, the analysis of the dramaturgy to the final findings is not clearly articulated.

I am curious about the reference to the United Nations document on Human Rights (reference #13, line 150). I read the cited document and I could not see the link to the statement regarding the ubiquity of challenges of different governance and health systems. Please clarify. There seems to be some information missing in the paragraph beginning on line 340, "A second way outlined by Goffman to handle the problem of failed .." The second sentence alludes to an example about a GP that does not appear elsewhere in the manuscript, and is either out of place or needs some further description.

Line 347-348 - Should this say that the back stage functions "are" provided by AskFuse?

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An exceptional article

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:
1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal