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Reviewer's report:

This is a clearly written paper reporting an immense amount of work to bring together a range of KT tools and perspectives to form a conceptually coherent, useable framework. Some minor comments below.

ABSTRACT

Background:
The opening line is a broad statement - can the authors narrow this down to positive impacts of what - presumably quality improvement initiatives?
Last line - grammar needs correcting 'their variable needs or to[delete] deliver recommendations that is[are] most relevant and useful for them.'

Methods:
Last line - suggest refer to the online tool evaluated as a 'prototype' rather than 'mock-up.'

BACKGROUND
p5 L14 - can the authors provide some examples of quality improvement initiatives referred to here?
p6 L8 - can the authors provide a definition of 'integrated KT' for readers who may not be familiar?

METHODS
p6 L56 - typo 'ddynamic'

RESULTS
p13 L40 - can the authors define 'impact drivers' and provide more information on how the domains of the impact drivers were arrived at and the evidence drawn on to judge their importance over other aspects of KT?
p13 L44 - if the impact drivers are potentially important to all domains for KT strategies suggest say this rather than 'any or all three' as this sounds a little vague.

DISCUSSION
Can the authors comment on how they see this framework being developed, how it will cater for users with a range of experience in implementation, using theory etc?
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