

Reviewer's report

Title: Ethical issues in implementation research: The problem of informed consent

Version: 2 Date: 22 October 2008

Reviewer: M Wensing

Reviewer's report:

My previous comments have been well addressed. The structure of a reflective paper is obviously more difficult than the structure of a research paper, but I feel that it can still be improved.

It is a bit strange to start with a background section, which is then immediately followed by a discussion section. The section "Which ethics?" is still somewhat unspecific (despite shortening) and reads more like a Discussion section. So, perhaps the middle part of the paper could be headed differently and this last section could be headed 'Discussion'.

Another, final remark. This reflective paper is basically an argument for a more flexible approach to informed consent in implementation trials, rather than a balanced presentation of different viewpoints. Perhaps this should be expressed more upfront, for instance in the title of this paper.

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.

Declaration of competing interests:

As an implementation researcher, I have financial and non-financial interests in a more flexible approach to informed consent in implementation studies.