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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

There are a number of inconsistencies in the manuscript that require attention prior to a decision to publish:


2. Methods: para 2: Can you please clarify why your group chose to target these two specific recommendations from the guideline?

3. Procedure: Can you please clarify your recruitment and sampling procedure? It is not clear how many interviews were conducted. Under Characteristics of participants you describe 13 but in section describing Reinforcement and Skills you refer to 18 participants.

4. Analysis: para 1: line 2 & 3: Can you confirm that AB (Principle investigator) reviewed the coding and then submitted comments to AB (one of four investigators)

5. Analysis: Phase 1-Identification of barriers and enablers: Can you reorder these paragraphs for clarity - Data saturation was likely established prior to 2-day meeting of 15-member committee. Can you clarify if two independent reviewers identified relevant domains?

6. Analysis: Phase 2 – Identification of intervention components: Can you please clarify the procedure for ranking by meeting participants: most or least relevant to what? It is not clear how/if the 15-member committee considered best available evidence to guide selecting KT interventions, modes of delivery or possible actions during the brainstorming exercise.

7. Results: Environmental Context and Resources: Phase 2: you describe 4 strategies which will be placed on the new CCGI website to address resource deficits. It is unclear how this strategy is folded into the Multifaceted KT intervention.

8. Results: Reinforcement and Skills: are outlined as two domains in the TDF. You provide no rational for combining them in your report.

9. Results: Knowledge: Phase 1: Line 5&6: somewhat confusing to tease out how
many participants these beliefs refer to. Phase 2: “about one third of statements suggest that clinicians mostly rely on their experience" this is somewhat unclear when your report data supporting this as 9/59 statements?

10. Can you describe in more detail how you plan to make the webinar interactive?

11. Results: Memory, Attention and Decision Processes: Phase 2: Lines 7-11. Might be better positioned in Discussion section or Conclusion given automated reminders are not feasible in current environment.

12. Results: Social Professional Role and Identity: Phase 1: Not clear from description if the authors identify this as a barrier or enabler? Phase 2: The authors describe possible application of Community of Practice but it is unclear how this is included in the Multifaceted KT Intervention?

13. “Beliefs about consequences” is identified as an important domain in the Abstract and Discussion section, however there is no description in the Results section.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Please correct inconsistencies with author’s initials on cover page and throughout manuscript ie. AEB or AB (Material line 4), FAZ or FZ

2. Please review the manuscript for inconsistencies in use of present/past tense

3. Please review the manuscript throughout for correct use of TDF domain names...Environmental Context and Resources; Memory, Attention and Decision Processes

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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