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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript (commentary) points to the important issue of increasing the capacity of peer review to assess the KT component of the research application and the peer reviewers' need for specific knowledge and training. The very informative overview of literature and websites illustrates the funders and community-consumers roles regarding peer review and KT. However, it is short on information about clinicians regarding KT although they are (should be) key users of research findings. Recommendations are interesting and quite ambitious - it would be worth following and evaluating their implementation.

Overall I suggest to condense and restructure to be clearer and capture the attention of the reader. I find it a bit strange to jump from the background to discussion. Most of "Discussion" is in fact overview of various players' doings based on lit and website analysis and your take on it. Reading it several times I managed to figure what others do and what you think about it. At least I hope I managed.

- The first few && of the "Discussion" are in fact a background. Line 97 hints the methodology. In that contexts discussing with colleagues is a bit vague: which colleagues? In BC or worldwide? Roughly how many and how? (line 98). Line 117 might be seen as a hypothesis (or part of it). Then follow overview of lit and of various organizations doings (not always clearly stating which one is from where- for example it is not mentioned that Ruppertsberg (ref 11) talks about the UK. This overview often includes your (author's) take on them...sort of findings with interpretation. A table or figure would help. Line 201 starts with your proposal-like conclusion...

- Recommendations are clearly stated although I could not always find the link to the above ie how you arrived to some of recommendations. Also some of them sound a bit too ambitious-like having external panel of KT experts- one could argue that there is a need for such external topic panel for other topics. Or perhaps you thought of informal KT panel Canada wide that you can call upon?

As mentioned above I suggest that you condense and restructure to be clearer and capture the attention of the reader.

- Figures/ illustrations would help. You may wish to be more precise and for example propose whether you propose orientation each time, prior and /or after the peer review exercise/meeting.
Indeed, individual peer reviewers are not experts across the range (Line 101) and do not need to be- this is why there are several for each proposal.

Is the orientation combined with guidelines aiming to address that.

I have problem with the term "training. I reckon that peer reviewers have to gain knowledge, so education would be better term; training is more how to apply the knowledge one already has.

Few edits are needed. For example:

* Lines 170-173- The sentence on RAND is unclear. Please revise.
* Line 72: The statement that NIH introduced the peer review of grant applications needs a reference or take it out- the history of peer review is longer and more complex.
* Lines 137-143, Ref 22- Gelman, no need to repeat the number (22) at the end of the &
* Lines 177-181- about Australia : I reckon that it is the ref 27, not 28 which is added at the end of the & (could not verify whether the UK paper discusses Australia - could not read that paper, it is not open access)
* Line 190/ ref 30 is the email address, pls correct

General comments:

I argue that the scientific excellence (lines 79 +) should still be the primary criterion for evaluation of the research proposal - it is the prerequisite of the eventual translation of research-implementation/kt and any other 'uses', including advancing the knowledge, and its application, updating the evidence needed for evidence informed decision making.

It would be good to see whether you recommend that the KT specific guidelines should be included in the overall review guidelines or? Namely the criteria for evaluating /assessment the KT aspect of the proposal should link to or include applicant's data management and data sharing plan- in case it is not already included in overall guidelines. One study alone, no matter how KT savvy, is seldom sufficient (might even be dangerous) source of the evidence needed for evidence informed decision making- so it is essential to make data available to include in re-analysis and meta-analysis.
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