

Reviewer's report

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

Version: 1 **Date:** 9 May 2006

Reviewer: Carl Thompson

Reviewer's report:

Reviewer's report

Please number your comments and divide them into:

- Major Compulsory Revisions

No major revisions but see discretionary comments which would considerably strengthen the paper in my opinion

- Minor Essential Revisions

P4 knowledge is misspelt first para background section

Bottom p4 " passive strategies are rarely ineffective " do you mean rarely effective? Although in the light of the Grimshaw UK HTA report on guideline dissemination rarely ineffective might be correct!

- Discretionary Revisions

I think that the discussion requires:

a) an explanation of the limitations of reported behaviour versus observed behaviour vis a vis "information behaviour". There is a reporting bias present in surveys that needs accounting for: what people say they do and what they actually do are often different.

b) there is no explanation of the role of human agents in knowledge transfer. This is surprising as the preferred format for informing choices in practice (when people are observed) is other human beings rather than ANY text based material (see for example,

Thompson, C., Cullum, N., McCaughan, D., Sheldon, T., Thompson, D., Mulhall, A. Acute care nurses' use of research information in clinical decision making: what's useful. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 2001; 36 (2) 376-378.

Carl Thompson, Nicky Cullum, Dorothy McCaughan, Trevor Sheldon, and Pauline Raynor . Nurses, information use, and clinical decision making "the real world potential for evidence-based decisions in nursing. *Evid Based Nurs* 2004 7: 68-72.

This needs visiting in the context of this paper. Particularly as similar findings extend to nurse practitioners (see Cogdill at <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?rendertype=abstract&artid=153161>)

And doctors (see Gorman 1999 <http://bmj.bmjournals.com/cgi/content/full/319/7206/358>)

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.