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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting and topical paper and one that I enjoyed reading. However, I was also left with a number of questions and reflections, which I would suggest the authors need to address to provide a tighter and more critical debate paper.

- My main reflection having read the paper was something of a 'so what' question. Yes CBPR and IKT share a lot in common, with some subtle differences, but why and how does this matter to those interested in implementation and implementation research? Although I can see that revisions have been made to address the original editorial comments on the paper, the content is still highly descriptive and I think some further analysis to tease out specific implications for implementation science would be useful.

- Linked to the above point, some specific case examples illustrating the application of CBPR and IKT in implementation studies would help to focus the discussion and highlight key points that the authors are trying to get across, particularly in relation to points of convergence and divergence between the two approaches.

- Reference is made to different theoretical research traditions that underpin CBPR and IKT (pages 9 and 10) without expanding on what these different theoretical underpinnings in any detailed way. Again, further exploration of these issues would elevate the critical discussion within the paper.

- The overall sense at the end of the paper is more convergence than divergence between the approaches and a key question that arose for me is whether IKT could be seen as a more pragmatic application of CBPR principles by research funders with a specific focus on health systems and application of knowledge, as opposed to there being two distinct approaches.

Overall, I think this paper could make a useful contribution to the literature, but I would suggest further revisions are needed to strengthen the level of critical debate within the manuscript. There is also a fair amount of repetition within the paper e.g. around the promise of co-creation etc., which would benefit from some further editing.
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