

Reviewer's report

Title: Research Designs for Studies Promoting Healthcare Organization Change: Should Action Research Have a Place at the Table?

Version: 3 **Date:** 14 April 2009

Reviewer: Jeffrey Braithwaite

Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors

This manuscript has been strengthened and is closer to acceptance. I have several minor essential revisions to suggest, aimed at strengthening the ms further.

Minor essential revision #1

Abstract, Discussion, line 4: I think the ms should read "... study designs are discussed ...".

Minor essential revision #2

Background, line 2: The ms should read "... in international health systems[1-5]." [delete "... this country[1-5]."]

Minor essential revision #3

Participatory action research defined, second paragraph: there are no reference details provided for the two studies mentioned [the NHS review in 2001 and the AHRQ report in 2004].

Minor essential revision #4

Summary - Why including ...: in this section heading, delete the word Summary and begin the heading with "Why including ... outcomes. [This section is not really a summary]

Minor essential revision #5

In this same section I think there should be some mention [perhaps an additional paragraph is needed] as to how people can implement the new model. The combined RCT-PAR model has merit and deserves to be discussed. However, while the case is made I did not get the sense that the authors had provided enough of the how it might be made to work. I don't think they can or need to provide something definitive or extensive. But an extra paragraph of how might help, and is crucial in my judgement in the light of the purpose and aims of Implementation Science.

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.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests