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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports on a mixed methods study of knowledge brokers' (KB's) use of theories and models to guide their work and evaluative practices. Qualitative data was collected via interviews with KBs which was then triangulated with quantitative data collected using an online survey. KB/KT processes vary greatly and are highly contextualised and reflections on the KB/KT process are not often the focus when reporting project findings. This research, therefore, provides valuable insights into the "real-world" practice of KB and its limitations, particularly relating to evaluations of KB/KT activities.

Specific comments:

1. In the opening sentence of the introduction, knowledge brokering (KB) is described as a new approach to knowledge translation (KT). However, these terms are then used interchangeably throughout the paper. This needs to be clarified with definitions describing how these are activities are different or similar.

2. The introduction would benefit from a broader review of the literature. Particularly the literature from leaders in the knowledge translation / mobilisation field such as Huw Davies, Bev Holmes, Sandra Nutley, Alan Holmes and John Lavis. A particularly important reference relating to this research is Davies HT, Powell AE, Nutley SM. Mobilising knowledge to improve UK health care: learning from other countries and other sectors-a multimethod mapping study.

3. The manuscript requires further editing and finalisation. It was missing content/words e.g. "be" in the discussion section of the abstract, first paragraph on page 5 includes "WHICH?", underlined spaces following "Diffusion of Innovations" on page 5 and also on pages 11 and 16, "WHO?" on page 8, etc. Many of these instances appear to be marking locations in the text that required further information.
4. The use of telephone interviews instead of face-to-face should be explained.

5. The survey instrument should be included in the Appendices.

6. Further description of interview participants would be informative and could be provided without compromising their identities e.g. describing their gender, the range of experience of interviewees (range of years in the industry) and roles in a broad sense - how many worked in government, non-government, research sectors, for example.
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