

Author's response to reviews

Title: Establishing an Implementation Network: Lessons Learned from Community-Based Participatory Research

Authors:

Laurie A Lindamer (llindamer@ucsd.edu)
Barry Lebowitz (blebowitz@ucsd.edu)
Richard L Hough (rlhough@aol.com)
Piedad Garcia (Piedad.Garcia@sdcounty.ca.gov)
Alfredo Aguirre (alfredo.aguirre@sdcounty.ca.gov)
Maureen C Halpain (mhalpain@ucsd.edu)
Colin Depp (cdepp@ucsd.edu)
Dilip V Jeste (djeste@ucsd.edu)

Version: 3 Date: 15 September 2008

Author's response to reviews: see over

Dear Dr. Mittman:

We have made the suggested changes to the manuscript entitled “Establishing an Implementation Network: Lessons Learned from Community-Based Participatory Research”. Below we address the specific comments.

Reviewer 1

There is still absolutely no description of the partnership and it's outcomes; only a one-sentence reference to another paper. A paper that can't be read on it's own seems unacceptable. As I mentioned in my original review, there should be some brief description of: Key milestones the partnership formation (grants received, any pilot work, other prior history); Mission and goals; Funding amount and governance structure; Staffing; Implementation projects that were envisioned in the (NIMH?) proposal; Implementation projects that have actually been carried out, including description and results.

We have the paragraph below to address the concerns raised by Review 1.

“The partnership was developed from funds from the National Institute of Mental Health designated to support implementation of research networks. The initial goals of the partnership included needs assessment, utilization analysis, and public education. Details of the outcomes of this partnership have been described elsewhere [11]. Briefly, however, the partnership has accomplished many significant outcomes. For example, the partners have conducted and disseminated a system-wide needs analysis of health services for older adults [12]; investigated the use of mental health services by gender, ethnicity, age, psychiatric diagnosis, and housing status [13-18]; provided several educational events, including a “miniconference” to the 2005 White House Conference on Aging. Moreover, to increase collaboration a Community Advisory Board was formed to solicit stakeholder input at the study design phase of the research process, and the partners formed a coalition to provide education and advocacy for older adult mental health needs that has become a formal program of NAMI San Diego. Here we highlight the processes by which the collaboration was developed and maintained and the lesson we have learned.”

Review 2

P7 last line - I think this should be partners and not partnership

P8 second paragraph- please state how often ‘regular meetings’ were held and who attended them

P16 the final sentence should be participatory based research project - to link it with the method chosen in the introduction.

Review 2 suggest minor essential revisions, which we have made.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Laurie Lindamer