

Reviewer's report

Title: QUERI Series: Implementing and evaluating a regional strategy to improve testing rates in VA patients at risk for HIV utilizing the QUERI process as a guiding framework

Version: 3 **Date:** 17 May 2007

Reviewer: Martin Eccles

Reviewer's report:

General

Thank you for re-submitting your article in the QUERI Series and for your comprehensive letter of response to our and the reviewers comments. In the light of this there are a small number of further changes we would like you to make to the article.

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

None

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

Page 3 paragraph 5. First line 'development OF effective decision'. Delete duplicate mention of 'the development of decision support tools'. Delete the two mentions of 'in the VA' as the paragraph is clearly referring to the QUERI Centre.

Page 6 Decision support paragraph. You should delete the reference to Table 4 and remove Table 4 from the paper. The set of internal codes is not relevant to a readership outside of the VA. You indicate the headings of the table in the text at the end of this paragraph and this is sufficient.

Page 6 last paragraph. The reference to the Jamtvedt review is now out of date and should be updated – the review has been updated and now contains 118 studies.

Page 7 fourth full paragraph third line typo 'materials for a these audience'.

Page 8 paragraph 3. You describe your interventions as 'theory based'. Whilst this term has been in common usage it is increasingly being reserved for those interventions where explicit theoretical constructs are targeted and measured within an intervention process and the success of the intervention judged by its ability to change the targeted constructs. What you describe would now better fit under the label of 'theory-informed' (some authors use the term theory inspired). We would like you to change the term to one or other of these terms.

Page 8. There appears to be a formatting problem with the sub-section heading in the middle of the page.

Page 8. At some point (and it may not be best here) is it possible to give an estimate of the total population that the clinical facilities serve. This would give the reader a better idea of their size and the scale that you were working on.

Page 9 paragraph 2. You refer to a set of title in parentheses (attendings etc). These are confusing terms for any reader not in the USA. Could you rewrite them in more descriptive terms that would be understandable to a general reader. This should be done throughout the article.

Page 9 paragraph 4 line 3 typo 'that HAVE AN impact ON the success'.

Page 9 Results first line. It is not clear what the term 'reminder satisfaction' means. Does it mean that the reminder was appropriately addressed, as opposed to some measure of use satisfaction? It would be helpful if you could clarify this.

Page 9 the last sentence on the page (which carries on to page 10) doesn't seem to make sense.

Page 10. In the discussion you have used underlining for sub-section headings. This doesn't correspond to journal style and should be removed.

Page 12 last paragraph line 5. I don't think there should be an s on calls.

Table 3 second row- VA providers regard HIV testing... something seems missing.

Also in the title of table 3 and heading for column #3- shouldn't it be the chronic care model not the critical care model?

Table 4. As indicated above, this should be removed.

Figure 2 is helpful. However, in order to include it you should remove all the names and email addresses from it. I suggest that you replace these with the sort of titles that you would use if you were doing a mail merge – Please contact <name> at <email address>. For the last line you may wish to do this or just remove the line as it has no additional meaning in the context of this paper.

Martin Eccles & Ian Graham
QUERI Series Editors

What next?: Accept after minor essential 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.