Reviewer’s report

Title: A Mixed Methods Examination of Knowledge Brokers and their Use of Theoretical Frameworks and Evaluative Practices

Version: 2 Date: 18 Feb 2020

Reviewer: Kara Decorby-Watson

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the revisions you’ve made to date - this version is more transparent. I think the fact that knowledge brokers (KBs) self-identified is important, particularly with such variety in roles, organizations and titles.

You changed the use of 'validation' of qualitative data with quantitative data, (now page 8, line 21-22). There was originally no citation and I questioned the implication of quantitative data to validate qualitative data. Now that you cite in your response to reviewers Creswell &amp; Plano (2007, p62), suggest you use the citation in the text where you would like to use the term 'validate' so that your source is clear. As a reviewer, I look up sources wherever one has been cited if it's something I'm questioning, so it's good to have that reference and would be helpful to the reader to have it in the text too. Without a source, I thought 'validate' was strong language for the use of quantitative data with qualitative and would not use this terminology myself; however, if you have a source then a change in language isn't needed, just a citation.
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