

Reviewer's report

Title: A Social Marketing Approach to Implementing Evidence-based Practice: The TIDES Depression Collaborative Care Model in the Veterans Health Administration Quality Enhancement Research Initiative

Version: 1 **Date:** 15 February 2007

Reviewer: Michel Wensing

Reviewer's report:

General

- 1.The paper has a free format. For instance, it does not follow the conventional introduction-methods-results-discussion format. The use of a conventional format would make it easier accessible, but I must admit that I have no specific suggestion for such format, other the the convention research paper format.
- 2.Also, I was not sure about the appropriate tense (past or present) for this paper. It may be most accessible if it uses the past tense to describe experiences or activities, which were undertaken in the VHA.

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

- 3.Specific aims of the paper are not provided, but should of course be included. Also, they should be provided in the first section of the paper (page 5 or sooner). The text on page 12 contains an overview of the content, but this is already halfway the paper !
- 4.The paper may have value in relation with other papers, but the relevance of the paper by itself was unclear to me. Why is it relevant for the world to read about how social marketing is applied to depression management in the VHA ?
- 5.It remained unclear to me why "social marketing" was chosen out of all possible approaches to implementation of innovations. It is presented as a fact, but have other approaches been considered and why was social marketing preferred?

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

- 6.I would have expected some information in the paper on the current level of adoption of best practice for depression. This is a step in most models of implementation, including the QUERI model. It would add to the relevance and the context of what is described in this paper.
- 7.The discussion section is not particularly informative. I would suggest to shorten it seriously, similar to such section in a research protocol.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

- 8.The text on the TIDES national marketing plan it self is clear and fine (p14-20).

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory 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.