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Implementation Science Reviewer's Critique

Title: How and how well do knowledge brokers facilitate knowledge translation in health-related settings? A systematic review and thematic analysis

Reviewer's Comments:

This paper describes a systematic review of the literature on KB seeking to gather evidence of the nature of the knowledge brokering role in health-related settings and to determine if knowledge brokers effectively contributed to knowledge translation in these settings. The significance of the issue and background information providing context for the review was provided. The methodology described is comprehensive and appropriate to ensure broad reach and distillation of information. A PRISMA Checklist is provided with acknowledgement of the source of information for each criteria in the paper (e.g. by page number). Limitations of the review are described and the implications for future research are included. This paper is a valuable addition to the knowledge about KB in health care settings and highlights the need for more research to understand the roles, function and effectiveness of KB on professional practice. This paper addressed an important topic and would serve the interests of interprofessional practice teams, clinicians and decision makers interested in KB and implementation science. The references listed were related to the content, are current and were appropriate to include. Overall, the manuscript is very well written, interesting to read and fairly complete in its presentation of the methodology used for and the results of the systematic review of the literature. However, I feel the following compulsory revisions are required before it is acceptable for publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract - Required revisions:

• A statement about inclusion/exclusion criteria for paper selection should be added to the description of the methods in the abstract.

• Brief statement about the limitations of the SR should also be included in the results section of the abstract.

• Overarching statement about the implications for practice, education and policy...
should be included in the abstract.

**Background and supporting literature - Required revisions:**

- Recommend clarification of what the authors judge to be a ‘health-related setting’ – are they referring to a place where specific care is provided or a specific setting defined by location – this is not clear to the reader and therefore I would not be able to replicate the SR using their screening criteria
- Include a PICOS statement

**Results - Required revisions:**

- Provide a brief descriptive summary of the included studies (e.g. health care settings and country where studies took place etc.)
- Provide details about the excluded studies and rationale for exclusion – add reason for exclusion to the PRISMA flowchart

**Discussion - Required revision**

- Discuss implications of the study findings for practice, education and policy setting.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

Sandy Dunn RN PhD

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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