

Reviewer's report

Title: Site-Diagnosis and the Use of Multidisciplinary Teams of Local Clinicians and Clinical Experts: A QUERI-Related Process for Developing Implementation Interventions

Version: 1 **Date:** 25 September 2006

Reviewer: Marjukka Mäkelä

Reviewer's report:

General

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

The terminology should be consistent. Was this a "multisite demonstration project" of "Phase 2" (page 6) or "organisational efficacy study" of "Stage 2" (p 20) or a "Phase 2 implementation study" (p 22)?

As an example of Phase (Stage?) 2 study, it would be useful also to summarise the resources used. Now on p 19 the study is described as involving "significant external facilitation, time, and effort". How much QUERI staff time and target institution staff time was used? A time graph showing the series of steps taken and the resources (in hours, for example) used at each step would be very useful. This would help in removing vague expressions, such as "much time had passed", "as soon as was feasible" (p 11).

Not all of the many acronyms are explained when they first occur in the text (VISN, VA, SDP, PI, EC...). Please clarify and consider providing a separate terminology list for the article or the entire series (I assume these would repeat through several of the articles). This list could also include the QUERI definitions.

The Abstract is not consistent with the content of the article; its conclusions, especially "these efforts increase the likelihood of implementation..." are not based on what the authors did but on previous literature. The results section is missing; this could include a process time table and examples of site specific interventions developed.

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

Brief description of VA is needed in the Background (xx medical centres, 850 clinics, >200000 staff providing services to 4.5 million veterans, x% male, mean age xx years (range yy-zz)). This is relevant to any non-US reader.

Please check the references for lacking data and consistency in style.

/ is not a word. Please use a comma, and, or or instead.

References to other studies in this series should be systematically made throughout the set of 16 articles, in order to avoid repetition and to keep the readers awake. E.g. writing on p 4 "The current article is the first of several manuscripts... section below." should be unnecessary here after the whole set is edited together.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

In general, the style is quite voluminous: "It is important to note", "As will be discussed later", "As noted above" etc. Be brief, cut the text down by 20%, and help the reader stay awake.

Table 1 has too much text and too little structure to pass as a Table.

Table 3 seems to provide a quite complete list instead of just examples as the heading suggests. Which one is intended?

Some of the language is jargony; it would be helpful to let a non-QUERI person read through the next version and check if they understand it. For example, passages on p 6: "To facilitate the QUERI centers... ..relevant stakeholders, etc.", and page 15: "EBQID fosters... ..as change agents." are complex structures that open to outsiders only with difficulty.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.