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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor

The paper "Building an Integrated Knowledge Translation (IKT) evidence base: Colloquium proceedings and research direction" is a commentary paper that its aim is to determine the future research agenda in the field of IKT. The subject of paper is so important to address knowledge-do gap. There are some major and minor considerations.

Major considerations:

1. The process of extract conclusions from IKTRN is not clear. There is some proposals (with suggested topic for research) and papers (with suggested ideas or some research based knowledge). How did members discussed about them, some papers(additional file 2) have responded to prioritized research agenda.

2. In abstract, what is difference or relations between content of lines 34,35,36 (conceptual categories) with 37,38,39 (prioritizes identified for future IKT research)? In the part of "future research agenda", again both of these have written but it's not clear differences or relations between them, how priorities have extracted from categories? The objective of meeting has been identifying the IKT research priorities, as I understand the categorizes and priorities are the same.

3. In the first paragraph of background, the authors has defined IKT, a model of research co-production that knowledge users identify a problem and have the authority to implement the research recommendations. In situations which the problem has identified through another sources (e.g priority setting system, media and ....) and research is done with integrated collaboration with stakeholders, according to the authors definition, is IKT or not? How much is important and essential the source of identifying problem?

4. In page 7, line 162, the "objective" is as important as the role, experience and process in engaging knowledge users, why does it absent? To determine the objective of knowledge

5. It will be so useful that authors explain "knowledge user", as the author perspective, is knowledge users and knowledge stakeholders, the same?

6. The attributions of stakeholders engagement in research are different by "type" of the, patient, health care provider or policy makers. This issue is absent in this commentary paper.
Minor considerations:

1. In the page 2, line 48, "it" refers to the IKT but the definition from references 2 and 3, are about KTE as general not IKT.

2. In page 4, lines 81-89, what was the title of "call" and what was the differences between proposal and paper?

3. One group of members of IKTN is "trainees", it's better authors describe more about them, do they teach KTE and implementation science, to whom?

4. In part of "finding of group discussion", there is not any description about "definitions and distinctions" in next lines.

5. In page 3, line 73-74 the name IK Research Network has been used for first time, please use it's abbreviation IKTRN here.
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