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Response to Reviewer Comments

We would like to thank the Editor for the opportunity to revise the paper in light of Reviewer comments and we thank the Reviewers for the feedback which has assisted us to improve this paper. We have provided detailed response to Reviewer comments below.

Response to Review by Alison Ritter

Major revisions

Comment 1: I would like to have seen a bit more substantive analysis of the findings...

Response 1: We thank the Reviewer for highlighting papers relevant to this article. We have utilized these authors in other related papers, however the specific papers referred to we had not previously referenced. We agreed that the paper has benefited from further, more substantive analysis and discussion of the findings and we have therefore revised the findings and discussion section utilising all of the suggested references and adding further references. As suggested we have provided further analysis and discussion of each of the positive predictor variables and furthered discussion on variables that were not significant that have been identified as important facilitators of research use in other literature. Please see tracked changes on pages 9-15.

Comment 2: There is no discussion of limitations...

Response 2: We have now added a section to the end of the discussion discussing the limitations and strengths of the study paying particular attention to the issues highlighted by the Reviewer. Please see tracked changes on pages 14-15.

Minor revisions

Comment 3: It would be helpful to see the questionnaire...

Response 3: The questionnaire has been attached. It is important to note that the survey was filtered based on the first question. Subsequent questions in Part 1 and 2 were related to the type of information participants indicated they used in Question 1. Questions in Part 3 were not filtered.

Comment 4: I'm not entirely sure about the approach to excluding part 1 questions as independent variables (aside from the demographics)....

Response 4: We focused on Part 2 and 3 because the inclusion of these factors was informed by existing frameworks and other research and were the expected predictors of research use, where questions in Part 1 were not expected to predict research use. More importantly however, purpose of use of research does not work as a statistical predictor of research use as the two variables are too closely related, which makes them redundant in a regression model. This will be an issue to consider in the further refinement of the survey.

Comment 5: I was interested to see that no questions from part 2 – sources of academic research – were significant...

Response 5: This finding was surprising and also unexpected by the authors. This was raised in the discussion. When tested individually (univariate) ‘Sought evidence from a researcher on a regular basis’ and ‘Co-authored a publication’ 2 of the 13 options for exchange and communication were
significant but when entered into the model with the other 26 individual predictors did not remain significant. The discussion on this has now been extended to include this detail. Please see tracked changes on Page 9.

**Comment 6:** There are of course many more questions that arise from the data, such as the extent to which the five variables which predicted academic research evidence use, are the same or different from those which would predict other types of information/evidence use.

**Response 6:** Further analyses are planned. We have now added mention of future/further research as part of the discussion on limitations. Please see tracked changes on Page 15.

**Comment 7:** There is a sentence page 9, first paragraph (“The five significant predictors... This indicates that research translation interventions developed for these agencies will need to focus on the policy setting as the primary target for intervention rather than the academic setting”) which is unclear.

**Response 7:** This was important to clarify, and has now been addressed. Please see tracked changes on Page 9.

**Comment 8:** There are a few typographical errors and referencing issues to be edited...

**Response 8:** These have now been amended. Please see tracked changes throughout and in Reference list.

**Response to Review by Nhan Tran**

**Comment 1:** I found the tables difficult to read and it would be helpful if the variable that were statistically significant were somehow highlighted...

**Response 1:** We would very much like to thank Nhan for his review and support for the publication of this paper. The results that were statistically significant have now been bolded and starred in both tables.