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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript.

This is a well written, and enjoyable to read manuscript. My comments and suggestions relate to minor essential reviews and discretionary revisions only.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract
1. Background, third sentence should read “… each of which comprise multiple phases”, not ‘phrases’.
2. Methods, sentence six, should read “Data were extracted”, not ‘data was’.

Main manuscript

Background
3. The Knowledge to Action Framework section, sentence three refers to 31 planned action models/frameworks, this needs to be corrected to planned action theories. Also, in sentence seven, ‘models’ should be corrected to ‘theories’.

Methods
4. Citation analysis and systematic review
5. First paragraph, sentence two – what is meant by ‘non-indicative abstracts’?
6. Second paragraph, sentence seven – should read ‘For Web of Science and SCOPUS citations and full abstracts were identified’?

Inclusion/Exclusion criteria
7. First paragraph, last sentence – what is meant by ‘text fragment in context’?
8. Third paragraph, around sentence four – the reader should be referred to Table 1. (Note that the header for this table states Table 2).

Data extraction
9. Sentence two should read, ‘Data extracted were mapped…’.

Limitations
10. Paragraph 6, sentence two – should read ‘… we excluded these data’.
Discretionary revisions

Discussion

11. Paragraph three, sentence two – Although it is probably self-evident, to be absolutely clear, I suggest expansion this sentence to say ‘The frequency of use in Canada could be explained by the influence of Canadian national networks and dissemination activities’.

12. Paragraph four, sentence two – I recommend expansion of this sentence to clarify how it could be a weakness and a strength. The statement, ‘in that the KTA Framework does not fit a particular project’ seems to be a weakness. What would a strength be in this situation?

13. Paragraph four, sentence four – the sentence, ‘In addition, conceptual frameworks are not mutually exclusive’, does not seem to flow from the previous sentence and it’s not clear what point is being made i.e., mutually exclusive from what? The sentence that follows, refers to this continuum of use, and again it doesn’t clearly flow from the sentence about mutual exclusivity. Also, the research utilisation categories are generally thought of as distinct categories, not a continuum.

14. Paragraph five, sentence four – this sentence about limited evidence for bringing information close to the point of decision making does not clearly flow from the previous sentence.

15. Paragraph five, sentence five – I suggest this be re-worded to say something like ‘Knowledge translation strategies can include elements such as linkage and exchange…’.

16. Paragraph nine, sentence four – In the statement, ‘Primary studies, exploring the direct experience and perceptions of different groups with a stake in implementation research’ do you mean studies of their experience in using theory to inform the research? The sentence might need re-wording to provide clarity.

17. Paragraph ten, first sentence – I recommend re-wording of this sentence to ‘Future research could examine the studies we categorised as…’.

Limitations

18. Paragraph one, sentence seven – the sentence about limited resources does not seem to be connected to the previous or the following sentences.

19. Paragraph three, sentence two – the reference to support the statement that multifaceted strategies are more likely to be successful than a single strategy is a protocol for a study. I recommend use of a research study reference instead.

General comment

20. As a general comment, the terms ‘strategy’ and ‘intervention’ are used interchangeably throughout the manuscript to refer to KT strategy/ies. I recommend consistent use of the term ‘strategy’ when referring to KT approaches. The intervention (evidence being integrated into practice) is then clearly separate from the KT strategy designed to promote uptake of the
intervention.

I hope these comments and suggestions are helpful.
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