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Reviewer's report:

The authors attempt a novel investigation: to describe current practices of health researchers in reporting "research translation and impact activities" (line 33) in their CVs. This is important because CVs are the coin of the realm in academic medicine and are important in making or breaking the business case for an academic career in research translation and impact.

The major concern I have about this endeavor is the heterogeneity of items that fall under the rubric of research translation and impact activities (Table 2 & passim). Specifically, the authors define research translation and impact activities as those that "close the research-practice gap, leading to better patient and health system outcomes" (line 33-34). They cite a mapping framework (lines 41ff) but do not appear to utilize it in choosing variables. For instance, very broad academic metrics that are traditionally used in many, many medical research CVs, such as the H-index and advisory/regulatory committee memberships. It would be much more informative to (a) explicitly map chosen variables to their framework and (b) include only those that are uniquely applicable to research translation and impact on non-research aspects of healthcare system performance. Sure, a high H-index supports impact, but it is impact on the closed system of researchers—as applicable to basic laboratory scientists as to health services and implementation researchers. No healthcare administrator ever asked me about my H-index when deciding whether or not to implement what I was supporting.

Additionally, the sample is drawn from a population that is a very narrow and specialized group, hardly a representative "cohort of health researchers" (abstract). Numbers (and response rate) would be much lower if this were a representative sample of the broad population of health researchers. This should be noted in the discussion and, probably, expectations lowered somewhat in the abstract and introduction.

Level of interest

Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal