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Reviewer's report:
Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript, which has clear relevance and interest to the field of Implementation Science. Congratulations on your completion of this complex multinational study. I believe it makes an important contribution to the literature, however I would like to make the following recommendations to address some issues prior to publication.

Overall
The manuscript could benefit from a review for grammatical clarity, to improve readability. For example, the final sentence in the results section of the abstract is quite long and doesn't clearly identify who benefited from the potential for learning over time, confidence and personal growth.

Background:
*Paragraph 2 - Which guidance in particular are you referring to?
*A little more information about realist informed inquiries would be helpful to readers who are unfamiliar with this approach. Any additional information need not be extensive, but a sentence or two defining what they are could be helpful

Method:
* You haven't clearly stated the aim of your study in the manuscript (although it is in the abstract) - this could be either at the conclusion of the background section or beginning of the method
* You mention that your engagement with the attendees of the KT colloquium was consistent with the focus of realist evaluation on stakeholder engagement. It would be good to acknowledge that this engagement was only with professional stakeholders, and particularly with people with a strong interest in KT (and not necessary with clinical knowledge of the practice problem being addressed)

* The data analysis section is the main issue with the manuscript as it stands, because it doesn't describe the trustworthiness measures taken in very much detail. There's some mention of triangulation, but you haven't stated who did the coding, whether there were multiple coders etc. Without a more detailed explanation of the qualitative rigour associated with your data analysis, it won't be possible for readers to critically appraise your study in preparation of translation into their own practice.

**Results:**

* Please use the abbreviations EF and IF consistently - some times these terms are spelt out in full, but the first use of EF isn't - it took me a while to figure out what an EF and IF were.

* The sentence 'These feelings were strongly expressed by those who had English as their second language' seems out of place, and may need some more contextual explanation

* The quote "one tries to follow the conversation the whole time ...." illustrates a point that has already been made previously in the manuscript - this section reads a little repetitively

**Discussion:**

* Do you feel the explanatory account of the antecedents and contingencies fully account for the response to the resources and opportunities, or are there other factors also at play?

I hope your find these recommendations helpful, and I look forward to the chance to read a revised version of this manuscript.
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