

Author's response to reviews

Title: QUERI Series: A Process for Developing Implementation Interventions

Authors:

Geoffrey M Curran (currangeoffreym@uams.edu)

Snigda Mukherjee (mukherjeesnigda@uams.edu)

Elise Allee (alleemarye@uams.edu)

Richard R Owen (owenrichardr@uams.edu)

Version: 4 **Date:** 27 June 2007

Author's response to reviews: see over

June 13, 2007

Dr. Martin Eccles
Dr. Ian Graham
Implementation Science

Dear Drs. Eccles and Graham:

Re: MS ID:

Title: QUERI Series: A Process for Developing Implementation Interventions

Lead Author: Geoffrey M. Curran

Thanks for the opportunity to re-submit a revised manuscript. We hope our responses to the concerns raised are satisfactory. A summary of the concerns and our actions taken are provided below.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey M. Curran

Reviewer 3

Minor Compulsory Revisions

--“We have thought about your title and think that it would be more accurately titled, ‘QUERI Series: A process of developing an implementation intervention.’”

Done.

--“Page 3: We don’t think ‘formative evaluation’ is the right term. We would like you to use ‘diagnostic evaluation’ instead.”

We use the term “diagnostic evaluation” as recommended, and we also note that the QUERI Series articles use “formative evaluation,” which encompasses a similar process. I hope this works for you. Here is the passage:

This development process is best considered a method for use in a diagnostic evaluation of an implementation intervention. Elsewhere in the QUERI Series this process is also referred to as a part of formative evaluation. Stetler et al. (2006) define formative evaluation as: “A rigorous assessment process designed to identify potential and actual influences on the progress and effectiveness of implementation efforts” [9, p.S1]. This definition encompasses four evaluative stages that recognize the importance of pre-intervention diagnostic activity, collection of process information during the implementation phase, tracking of goal-related progress, and interpretation of process and outcome data to help clarify the meaning of success or failure of implementation.

--“Page 15: Could you expand on the term [screeners] to make them descriptive of the process they fulfill? ”

Here the section with our revisions:

For example, one site already used their electronic medical record system to access brief screening surveys for other conditions and general intake procedures, and they chose to implement the evidenced-based depression screening with an electronic clinical reminder and to order psychiatrist consultations from the reminder through the electronic medical record.

--“Page 16: The notion of quick referral is unclear. Do you mean ‘urgent?’”

Yes. The sentence has been changed to indicate “urgent referral.”

--“Page 18: We think that you should change the word ‘trial’ to ‘study.’”

Done.

--“Page 20: Replace ‘implementation’ with ‘intervention.’ Same line replace ‘an optional’ with ‘a.’”

Done.

--“Table 2: We don’t understand how you can use the term randomized. The first sentence in the development panels row second column does not quite make sense.”

We matched 2 programs and randomly selected the intervention sites. That’s why we used the term randomization in the table. We looked that the sentence in the development panels row and it seemed like what made it unclear was that it was not in the past tense. We made the change and we hope this helped.

Comments from Ian Graham

--“Table 3: Reference to Rubenstein #39 is the wrong reference. A better title of Table 3 might be ‘Determinants of organizational change assessed by the diagnostic evaluation.’”

The correct reference number is 41 and has been changed. The title has been changed as recommended.