

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Translating clinicians' beliefs into implementation interventions (TRACII): an intervention modeling experiment to change clinicians' intentions to implement evidence-based practice.

**Version:** 1 **Date:** 27 December 2006

**Reviewer:** Hayden Bosworth

### Reviewer's report:

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The use of psychological theories to explain clinicians intentions and eventual behaviors is an important area of research and likely to be instrumental in ensuring implementation of evidence-based guidelines. However, while intentions are significant predictors of actual behavior, further examination of the predictive validity of these psychological theories emphasizing behavioral intention are minimal. There is often a discrepancy between intention to adhere to guidelines and actual adherence. That is, the relationship between intentions and behavior is less strong; in prospective studies, Theory of Reasoned Action and Theory of Planned Behavior variables, for example, only account for 20% to 40% of the variance in health behaviors 1-3.

A significant limitation of the current manuscript is a discussion of a planned study. It would have been more informative to evaluate and discuss the studies after they had been conducted and data were available. If the investigators chose to describe the ongoing research as a method for evaluating implementation of a provider intervention, greater detail will be required with a particular focus on implementation and evaluation.

While beliefs of the healthcare professional may be one factor of many that influences the effectiveness of intervention, there lacks discussion of why beliefs was chosen as the focus of the current paper.

The introduction is not well integrated. There lacks transitions between the sections. The manuscript reads as if it is a grant proposal.

Given that portion of the readership may not be as familiar with current psychological theories, further explanation and definition of terms would improve the readability of the manuscript.

In the proposed study, it is not clear why the investigators, in addition to accessing behavioral intentions and behavioral simulations, did not access actual behavior. This could be assessed in many ways including simply reviewing medical records.

There lacks a discussion and conclusion of the current study and how it integrates previous research.

Most importantly, it is unclear how the proposed study will demonstrate or inform our knowledge of implementation.

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The abstract requires some conclusion or generalization of the contribution of this study to the larger body of literature.

In general, the manuscript requires further proofreading. The second paragraph, last sentence, for example, is missing punctuation and is an awkward sentence.

The section on selecting interventions has limited empirical support. It is not clear if the authors have

developed the five bases for selecting interventions or there is support for these approaches. In general, statements like 'almost all of the implementation interventions conducted to date have selected interventions using intuitive/non-theory analytical or empirically successful methods' are unsubstantiated.

1. Armitage CJ, Conner M. Efficacy of the Theory of Planned Behaviour: a meta-analytic review. *Br J Soc Psychol* 2001;40(Pt 4):471-99.
2. Sheeran P, Orbell S. Do intentions predict condom use? Meta-analysis and examination of six moderator variables. *Br J Soc Psychol* 1998;37(Pt 2):231-50.
3. Godin G, Kok G. The theory of planned behavior: a review of its applications to health-related behaviors. *Am J Health Promot* 1996;11(2):87-98.

**What next?:** Reject as not sufficiently sound

**Level of interest:** Reject as not of sufficient priority to merit publishing in this journal

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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