

Reviewer's report

Title: A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity

Version: 3 **Date:** 26 September 2007

Reviewer: Marlies Hulscher

Reviewer's report:

General

I am very pleased with the alterations the authors made to the paper. I especially like their provision of case studies that describe the measurement of the elements of the framework.

Regarding the structure of the paper:

It is probably very difficult to make this paper fit the IMRD structure, as the results are very complex to describe. Maybe the following structure provides a clear presentation of the paper to the readers (sort of combination of the authors' previous discussion paper and a classic IMRD paper):

- BACKGROUND

same as already described, page 2 - 4

- CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF IMPLEMENTATION FIDELITY AND THEIR LIMITATIONS (or

CURRENT LITERATURE??)

Starting with the current information on 'Methods' page 4 (the last paragraph 'The discussion begins with..... future research' then should be deleted!)- page 8 (the last sentence 'All elements ...Figure 1' should be deleted or moved to 'PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

- PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

page 9 - page 20

- SUMMARY

page 21

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

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

Regarding the revised manuscript and authors' response:

As mentioned above, I am pleased with the revised manuscript, especially with the added examples.

1. I would prefer the authors to add the rationale for the additional elements at page 8 where they are mentioned first, as they are an outcome of the search of the current literature.

2. ok

3. I probably was not clear enough why I provided the reference: in the paper at least one study is provided as an example that does describe the research to identify the essential components of the intervention:

Hermens RPMG, Hak E, Hulscher MEJL, Braspenning JCC, Grol RPTM. Adherence to guidelines on cervical cancer screening in general practice: programme elements of successful implementation. *British Journal of General Practice* 2001; 51: 897-903.

4. Very nice! Maybe now the separate paragraph on measurement (page 20) is redundant or could be included in the description of the limitations of current conceptualisations.

5. ok

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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