*I am presenting below how I have addressed the comments of the reviewer in the revised version of the paper that I am transmitting today. I have tried as much as possible to avoid lengthening the paper but I could not avoid adding another 250 words.*

***1. The paper covers an extensive review of knowledge production and dissemination practices of CSOs. On the basis of this it provides implications for policy and practice in the development sector. It is thus in the core of the focus of the journal. It is an interesting and relevant paper* and I am looking forward to a revised draft. *The paper places the review of knowledge production and dissemination activities of 10 Ghanaian CSOs (which in itself is not necessarily relevant for a special issue on Transdisciplinary Research) in the context of mode-2 knowledge production. The latter does make it more relevant, but connections between the results and the theoretical concepts could be made more explicitly and specifically.***

I was surprised to read the above reference to transdisciplinarity because I responded to the following call for articles, sent by Sarah in April, and I concluded that my topic was relevant :

“The September 2013 issue of the KM4D Journal is on the theme of **Breaking the boundaries to knowledge integration: society meets science within knowledge management for development.** We are looking for contributions on:

- Knowledge integration and co-creation:
- Knowledge production in ‘non-traditional’ knowledge institutions, such as consultancy firms, think tanks and NGOs;
- Knowledge production by citizens and civic organisations looking to build counter-expertise;
- Joint processes initiated by non-academia (government, industry, public, NGOs) or scientists;
- Integration of multiple knowledges linked to the perspectives and roles of the various stakeholders: individual knowledge, local specialised knowledge, organisational knowledge and holistic knowledge (Brown 2011). This is by no means easy because of the different frames of reference and differences in opinion. Some stakeholders’ knowledge will be implicit, neither written down (codified) nor put into words;
- Participation of stakeholders in the process and in the design of the solution.
- Combination of methods which take into account the complexity of the system such as actor analysis, causal analysis, and system analysis;
- Encouragement of mutual learning in focus groups, round tables, expert sessions, stakeholder dialogues etc.
- Contributions focusing on local scientific, cultural and political practices.” (End of quotation from Sarah's email).

However, in response to one of the reviewer's comment I have added additional references to transdisciplinarity which strengthens the paper. Please see below.

***2. References should be carefully looked at (e.g. Nowotny 2001 should be Nowotny et al. 2001)***

References have been carefully looked at, including all of those with specific pages which have also been verified.

***3. The structure in itself is clear: there is an introduction followed by a conceptual framework, methodology, results and conclusion. However, relations between and within sections could be much stronger. E.g. within the section on the conceptual framework, three ‘models’ are highlighted. First, and most prominently, the concept of mode-2 research is discussed. Next it says at the bottom of page 3: ‘the main conceptual framework has been enriched by conceptual models of research dissemination and utilization’. The first question that arises is, by whom has the framework been enriched? (author, or already in the literature?) But more importantly, the links between the models on research dissemination and utilization on the one hand and the concept of mode-2 knowledge production on the other remain unclear and thus the actual ‘enrichment’ unsatisfactory. Moreover, it seems that the suggested models are partly incongruent with the concept of mode-2 knowledge production (e.g. concepts like science-push, demand-pull). Also, the separation of knowledge production and knowledge dissemination itself is more congruent with mode-1 than to mode-2 science.***

This comment is very valid and it is true that the linear view of the knowledge cycle is more congruent with Mode 1 than with Mode 2 research. However, we should not take for granted that targeted dissemination activities aimed at encouraging research uptake are the exclusive domain of mode 1 research. My rationale for including the concepts of knowledge dissemination and utilization was based on two main arguments:

* Before conducting my research I thought that some of the participating CSOs may not produce Mode 2 research and thus I needed conceptual tools to understand their activities which would most likely be closer to Mode 1 research;
* It is as if the authors (Gibbons et al. and Nowotny et al.) took for granted that knowledge dissemination and utilization would occur through, either a) a one way relationship between knowledge producers who would push their research findings to potential users (in Mode 1) or b) the gradual absorption of the new knowledge by the stakeholders who take part in the production of knowledge (in Mode 2), thus eliminating the need for promoting the utilization of new knowledge through more specifically targeted dissemination activities. But in reality, Mode-1 type of researchers do often more than just “push” their research results to potential users, they often engage with in dialogue, albeit on an irregular basis. Also, Mode-2 researchers may engage in targeted knowledge dissemination activities beyond the context of knowledge production to reach audiences not identified at the onset of the research project or not already part of the stakeholders' group.

I thought that what I considered as insufficient treatment (or conceptualizations) of the dissemination and utilization of knowledge by the authors of the New Production of Knowledge (Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotny et al. 2001) needed to be completed by other contributions coming from authors who have sought to understand dissemination and utilization models. That is why I decided to add other contributions to the conceptual framework. To address this comment in my revised paper, I have included an explanation of this decision in the section devoted to the theoretical section .

***4. Between sections: the paper would benefit from more explicit attention to the concepts outlined in the conceptual framework in the results & discussion sections. E.g. three examples are given for higher to weaker forms of contextualisation. The argument could be strengthened by being explicit about the ‘indicators’ or ‘features’ of the different forms of contextualisation (from literature) that the examples comply to. Apart from being more transparent in interpreting the data, in this way, others in the field of KM4D would have a better understanding of these features and be able to apply them to other initiatives.***

True, it is needed. I have gone through the Findings section and made the appropriate references to help the reader link the criteria/ indicators of research contextualization to the examples presented.

***5. Another example: in the discussion section ‘moving to the context of implication: tension amidst diversity’ it is indicated that the five tensions discussed all relate to the contexts of application and implication as defined by Nowotny et al. However the links between the literature and the tensions remain unclear.***

Indeed, the reviewer is quite right on this issue. I have revisited the references and furthered my thinking on this topic. As a result I have strengthened this part through more explicit linkages between the tensions described and the notion of the context of implication, as it applies to the knowledge work of the participating CSOS.

***6. Also in the implications section stronger links could be made with the concepts of mode-2 (or transdisciplinary research) as introduced in the first half of the paper.***

I have placed more emphasis on the importance of accepting a diversity of sources of evidence in the debate on the use of evidence for policies.

***7. Apart from comments above, I have the following (minor) comments:***

**-          section on mode-2 knowledge production requires some more precise referencing (e.g. last point of first paragraph of page 3 missed reference)**

Additional references have been inserted in paragraphs presenting mode 2 knowledge production.

***-          end of section on From weakly to highly contextualised knowledge (page 3) misses a concluding sentence highlighting the relevance of the paragraph***

I have added a sentence referring to the importance of these nuances for understanding the differences between the knowledge activities of the CSOs.

***-          in general, in order to be* relevant *to the special issue, the concept of mode-2 knowledge production and its manifestation in the selected CSOs should be more explicit and conceptualised more precisely. N.B. the fact that knowledge is produced outside of academia does not make this knowledge production process transdisciplinary, or mode-2. But here the point of strong contextualisation comes in; that’s why a more precise treatment of this concept would strengthen the paper.***

I agree, we have mode 1 research produced by 3 of these CSOs. More explicit references have been inserted about transdisciplinarity and mode 2 with the examples to illustrate the various degrees of contextualization.

*-* ***The third tension, on the epistemological dissonance seems in contrast to the statement that many projects … were of great quality (p. 12). I don’t know how to solve this but the point of epistemology dissonance seems tricky as it really suggests, however subtle it was put, that the quality of the research was quite low.***

The point was that it was possible to see that some of these research products, even the best ones, were not presented in a straightforward way, sometimes with little reference to the actual methodology. In some cases, good research was presented in ways that led the reader to understand that the research was conducted differently than it actually was. I have tried to present this argument more clearly to respond to your comment.