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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper, with a significant contribution to existing literature, filling an important gap that explores the similarities and differences of CBPR and IKT, to inform and advance future research in this area. To further develop the arguments within this manuscript, I offer the following suggestions and thoughts on its iteration and development.

Previous comments of reviewers such as "this paper needs to move beyond a basic description of the two approaches to sustain our interest further" have been addressed. However I wonder whether further comparative work of the approaches is needed to strengthen the contribution of the article.

Previous reviewers' comments have suggested that "we need you to address the lack of supporting evidence (see for example, Gagliardi 2016) for both approaches." Manuscript authors' edits made in response include: "While there is limited evidence about how to engage and involve knowledge users who are in health systems [14,15], evidence indicates that participatory approaches to research show promise for the conduct of collaborative research [16,17]."

I wonder if this does injustice to the amount of evidence that there actually is in these fields. This sentence does not acknowledge the work of patient and public involvement within health services research, an area where there is evidence on how to involve these knowledge users. Manuscript reference 14 (Gagliardi et al. 2016) in their IKT review, specifically excluded studies focusing on patients or consumers (p.3), as they were focussing on decision-makers. However, the manuscript authors seem to be discussing a much broader range of 'knowledge users' in this paragraph on p.5-6 than Gagliardi does. Manuscript reference 15 assessed CBPR evidence in 2004. However many more articles on CBPR have been published in the last decade since this was published, developing this evidence base, see evidence reviews by Salimi et al.[1] , Drahota et al.[2] and Cook[3]. Including these evidence reviews may also help to further address the previous reviewers' comments to "critically examine the conduct of collaborative research in health systems, using IKT and CBPR as examples."
Other comments on the text are as follows:

p.2 line 15. Research, not researcher?

p.2 line 19 'touch points'. In co-production literature[4] and experience-based co-design[5], the word touch point has a very specific meaning, that does not relate to its usage in the abstract. I suggest changing the word to something such as 'parallels' or 'similarities'.

The abstract sentence 'Both CBPR and IKT have similarities and differences that span the areas of motivation, social location, and ethics, which result in contextual differences in their employment' was not clear to me, before having read the paper. I wonder if another phrase can be used to illustrate the selling point and contribution of the article to a passing reader, to be able to grab more immediate attention?

In the abstract the authors highlight that there are different definitions and types of knowledge. However, on p.4 they seem to equate research evidence with knowledge:

p.4 lines 28-32. "Better use of research evidence ("knowledge") in health care practice requires partnerships between those engaged in the processes that produce research and those who are contending with the real-world needs and constraints of health systems and their users."

Perhaps it would be more consistent to include in brackets that research evidence is "one form of" knowledge.

p.5 Lines 50-52 and p.6 lines 11-13. This sentence is hard to read. Can the meaning be made any clearer?

If IKT is a "collaboration between researchers and decision-makers" (Gagliardi et al., 2016) i.e. people in positions of power, and CBPR works in partnership with members of marginalised communities to reduce injustice and inequities, there are key issues of power that could be interrogated further. Whilst this is done on p.15 I wonder if any more analysis can be done on the issue of addressing power differentials. Other CBPR literature may be useful to include, such as Muhammed et al.[6].
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