Title: Knowledge mobilisation in practice: an evaluation of the Australian Prevention Partnership Centre

Authors:

Abby Haynes (abby.haynes@sydney.edu.au;abby.haynes@saxinstitute.org.au)
Samantha Rowbotham (samantha.rowbotham@sydney.edu.au)
Anne Grunseit (anne.grunseit@sydney.edu.au)
Erika Bohn-Goldbaum (erika.goldbaum@sydney.edu.au)
Emma Slaytor (emma.slaytor@saxinstitute.org.au)
Andrew Wilson (a.wilson@sydney.edu.au)
Karen Lee (karen.c.lee@sydney.edu.au)
Seanna Davidson (seannadavidson@gamil.com)

Version: 1 Date: 13 Oct 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer #1: This is a very important manuscript "Knowledge mobilisation in practice: an evaluation of the Australian Prevention Partnership Centre", which provides important insights into practical approaches (knowledge mobilisation strategies) for partnership developing and moving forward to maximise contributions to policy and society. The methodology (a mixed methods approach) is thoroughly described, fully consistent with the objectives; the findings are important and support conclusions. The manuscript could be used as a road map for building and strengthening partnerships in health and provides a Partnership Centre model for impactful research collaboration between policymakers, practitioners and researchers.

Authors: Thank you - we appreciate these supportive comments

Reviewer #2: This is an interesting study that seeks to understand how mobilisation of knowledge is developed to impact policy making and promote policy-informed research using the Australian Prevention Partnership Centre as a case study. Through a mixed method that involves surveys and interviews with policy makers and research partners, it assesses the activities employed to operationalise a series of Centre's strategies and identifies challenges in knowledge mobilisation. Below are my main comments:
1. I think the article is in general well-written. However, I often felt it was not self-contained, as I had to review information only provided as supplementary materials in order to understand the main text. I understand that this article is based on information provided in a previous article, but I think more information on participant recruitment and data collection could be included. I find the COREQ checklist a very useful resource to report qualitative research. I think an anonymised descriptive table of participants or information on the percentage of participants from each professional background (e.g., policymakers, researchers, both) taking part in each research activity could be useful to also understand the results.

Authors: Anonymised descriptive information about numbers and types of participants in each stage of data collection is included in Table 1. As suggested, we have added more detail about participant recruitment and data collection, including estimated proportions of participants (page 11).

In our view, the additional files contain supplementary non-essential information that we have provided only for those who want more detail (in line with our objective of making the process of partnership research more transparent). This information is not needed to understand the findings or the paper overall. However, we have added brief descriptions of what further information readers can find in the Additional files as this may help them decide whether they want this information or not.

We include a completed COREQ checklist with this resubmission. This is for reference by reviewers and editors, but not for inclusion in the manuscript.

Reviewer #2, comment 2. The results section contains abundant descriptive information that, from my point of view, could be included in the background. I understand that authors want to help the reader cross-reference between the Centre's strategies and the themes related to them, but this amount of description obscures and hides the results. For example, in page 16 (lines 38-47), this is a good quotation and the theme itself is very relevant but it does not stand out.

Authors: We have moved the narrative accounts of knowledge mobilisation strategies out of the results and into the section that describes the Prevention Centre’s program model. This information has also been reduced because the full range of strategies is now outlined in the newly inserted Table 2 (see below). This table makes the themes more salient as it clearly delineates the strategies and the themes relating to them. We believe this is a good compromise as readers won’t be distracted by descriptions of background information in the results, but they can still link these strategies to the results by reading the table (and so will not have to move back and forth within the paper).

Reviewer #2, comment 3. In relation to number 2, it would be useful to include a summary of themes related to each strategy. I think authors could include a table (similar to Table 2) with the main themes and minor themes and supporting information from surveys and participants feedback so the reader can have an overall impression of the results. This would also make the study findings more easily identifiable by the reader and research community, for example, for researchers doing a systematic review on the subject.

Authors: Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have added a new table (Table 2) that summarises the results including the implementation strategies used, strengths and achievements, perceived benefits and further challenges and areas for improvements. This table will be inserted on page 13 but is currently positioned at the end of the manuscript (pages 40-41) because it extends over one A4 page.
Reviewer #2, comment 4. There is little allusion to published literature when reporting results or discussing the findings. Some results are very illustrative of the challenges that policymakers and researchers may find in mobilising knowledge and the addition of literature supporting the findings could highlight their relevance and credibility, like in page 27 (lines 21-23) and page 29 (line 20).

Authors: As suggested, we have incorporated greater reference to relevant findings in other studies about some of the challenges we highlight, including some recently published articles. We have confined this to the discussion rather than add literature to the results. See page 28, lines 20-26; page 29, lines 2-4 and 8-11; and page 41, lines 4-6.