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Author’s response to reviews:

Hello HRPS,

Re: the enclosed version of our manuscript (R3), the Reviewer asked for one change - essentially to move our citation from the end of the sentence closer to where the substantive claim about trustworthiness is being made.

Recall for context: in R2, we'd softened the language re: QUAN enabling us to increase the trustworthiness of the QUAL, but as a matter of record, we pointed out in our Response to the Reviewer a Creswell reference that truly supports such as assertion. So convinced, the Reviewer has asked us NOT to soften the language so much, but rather to substantiate it with the properly placed reference.

As such, we've reinserted the original sentence, and rather than citing Creswell at the end of the sentence, we do so as follows:

Such analysis enabled us to increase the trustworthiness of our qualitatively derived conclusions [25] and is well suited to this study’s purpose (to examine theoretical and evaluative practices of KBs) in that the analytic aim is to understand knowledge brokering practices by obtaining different but complementary data on the topic. (p.12).
We've enclosed in this submission a tracked changes and clean version of the manuscript, and believe that we have now fully satisfied all of the Reviewers' recommendations.

Thank you for your ongoing support through this process,

Ryan