

Reviewer's report

Title: Lessons from the evaluation of the UK's NHS R&D Implementation Methods Programme

Version: 3 **Date:** 30 October 2006

Reviewer: Ian Graham

Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have done well at incorporating the reviewers' suggestions. my remaining comments are minor.

Is there any data on the denominator for the email surveys?

p7 section Interviews- for consistency, please provide the response rates for the interviews in the results section

p8 section- Impact on research- how low is 'too low'

p9- section- Impact on teaching... views of IMP researchers- ok the response rates for the survey are in the first para of the methods section-

p10- section Qual findings... the interview response rates on p7 should go in this para

p17- section- The role.. 3rd line- should agree TO protocols

p18- section- influence of the...- line 8- it was this brief- what does this mean?

p19- 2nd para- has shaped the debate (consider adding- in the UK) ever since

p19- last line- and was itself was

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)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept without revision

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.