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Reviewer's report:

A well written and well conducted multiphase project on the development of a new tool for use by KT specialists. It is an ambitious undertaking to develop a "one-stop-shop" to guide knowledge users on all aspects of their desired KT practice activities, and although I am not convinced the authors have achieved this yet, they have used appropriate and rigorous methods to begin this process.

1. The main limitation of the project is the narrow representativeness of the Delphi panel. Despite the authors claiming that they recruited an "internationally representative panel…” (p8) only three members of the Round 1 panel were from countries other than Canada, and in Round 3 only one member was not from Canada; however, this is not discussed in the limitations section. This is an important limitation that needs discussion. What do you think are the potential impacts on the final form of KaT of this?, eg Canadian-based KT researchers/clinicians/knowledge users will have their own biases, like the pervasive presence of the KTA cycle.

2. The final version of the framework is simple and clean, but it is not self-explanatory. What supporting material (e.g definitions) will be available to users?

3. P10, 1st paragraph: "The decision to make a change to the KaT framework after each round was iterative, and based on the consensus score to include/exclude as well as the consistency of data between quantitative ratings and supporting qualitative." A little more information is needed here - Who did this, and what were the criteria for the data being consistent?

4. P18, "…our goal was to achieve representativeness rather than a large sample size". Did you achieve your goal, and if yes, how do you know that you achieved representativeness? Please expand on this.

5. It is not clear to me how the abbreviation "iKT" ended up in the final version of the tool, nor how useful this will be for users without explanation. Please clarify.

6. Table 5 indicates that only 5% of your sample self-identified as a "knowledge user" as their primary role. Do you think this has an impact on your results?

7. P10, sub-title incomplete: "Phase 3: Survey of KT knowledge users of a potential"
8. References: many references, other than journal articles, are incomplete

9. The next challenge is to more rigorously evaluate this tool in real world settings. Other than developing the online platform, please add in some discussion about what your recommendations are for this tool for future use and evaluation.
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