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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript which presents a validation the OR4KT questionnaire. The paper presents a sound analysis of the measure's psychometric development and is supported by evidence from the systematic review published in PLoSOne. There is a clear need for robust development of questionnaires in the implementation science literature. The questionnaire is tested in a pragmatic setting of a primary care study, which presents an interesting perspective and strengthens the relevance of the questionnaire to everyday implementation research.

The manuscript presents clear justifications for methodological decisions, such as selection of sample size (including description of snowballing recruitment) and the selection of the SOAPC and PPP questionnaires to test concurrent validity. It includes a thorough and comprehensive reporting of statistical analyses for psychometric testing across internal, concurrent and discriminant validity, reproducibility and reliability.

Two points of clarification should be addressed. The authors note the loading of items within the motivational dimension as the lowest across all of the six dimensions. There is a need to revise the theoretical structure of this dimension. Please describe what work will be undertaken to address this, or if this is not currently planned, explain why it is out-of-scope for this paper. Second, on page 15, paragraph 2, the authors discuss item reduction to develop a 'short version' of the instrument. How many items are included in this short version? It was difficult to understand how this will be different from the 59-items shown in Appendix 1. Clarification here would be most helpful.
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