

Author's response to reviews

Title: Information Transfer: What do decision-makers want and need from researchers

Authors:

Maureen Dobbins (dobbinsm@mcmaster.ca)

Peter Rosenbaum (rosenbau@mcmaster.ca)

Nancy Plews (plewsn@mcmaster.ca)

Mary Law (lawm@mcmaster.ca)

Adam Fysh (fysha@mcmaster.ca)

Version: 2 Date: 22 January 2007

Author's response to reviews: see over

McMaster University
1200 Main Street West, 3N25G
Hamilton, ON
L8N 3Z5
January 22, 2007

Dear Editors: Implementation Science,
Please accept this revised manuscript for review for publication at Implementation Science. I have made considerable changes and improvements to the original submission based on the feedback received from both reviewers.

The following issues have been addressed in the resubmission:

Reviewer 1

- 1) limitations of reported behaviour versus observed behaviour as it relates to KT.

I received the citations provided by the reviewer, discussed the issues raised and provide rationale and justification for the approach used in this study.

- 2) Role of human agents in knowledge transfer.

I have included additional literature that addresses the issue of the human component of KT, and placed the findings of this study within this broader context. I have also reviewed and included in the revision the suggested citations that address this issue.

Reviewer 2

- 3) Revise introduction and background sections, include broader review of the KT literature.

I have made considerable changes to the introduction, and now have one section labeled as the introduction, and have made this section more succinct. I have added more literature to this section, that encompasses a broader array from multiple countries and fields outside of nursing.

- 4) Provide justification for the inclusion of three vary disparate types of organizations in this study.

I have articulated more clearly my rationale for including the three organizations in my study, and provided more justification for this.

- 5) Provide justification for the inclusion of such a disparate group of decision makers.

I have provided more justification for the inclusion of each decision maker in this study. I have described more clearly who each decision maker was, what their roles were and what types of decisions they were involved in. I also provided considerably more detail on decision maker responses, so readers could see for themselves how the different decision makers responded.

6) Include more data in the tables.

I have included many more tables presenting the data by organization as well as position, and then the results of the analyses of variance, for all the variables discussed in the paper. It will be much clearer now for the reader to assess how and where organizations differed as well as decision makers. Data in the tables is now consistent with the text

7) Table 3 was problematic in that the items discussed were not reflective of research involvement.

This section was revised to reflect the concepts under study for these items which were measures of research use. The table and text now reflect this.

8) Identify the target audience of this paper

I have clearly articulated who the target audience of this paper is (health services researchers and research-producing organizations, particularly those who produce research evidence that is applicable for community-based settings), and have provided suggestions to users on how they could use the results of this paper.

9) Defend position that knowledge transfer is all that is needed for implementation of research findings

I have discussed more clearly the broader concept of KT as one that must involve the development and sustainability of collaborative relationship, which is an essential precursor to knowledge transfer. I have included multiple references to support these ideas. I have then placed the findings of this study within that broader context.

10) Provide justification for whether these findings have broad applicability to the larger health care setting.

I have articulated more clearly who these results are applicable to and why.

I have made every attempt to address in a meaningful way each of the issues raised by the reviewers, and feel this paper has been improved significantly as a result of these revisions.

I look forward to hearing your comments on this revised submission.

Sincerely,

