

Reviewer's report

Title: Ethical issues in Implementation Research

Version: 1 **Date:** 8 September 2006

Reviewer: Richard Ashcroft

Reviewer's report:

General

This is a clear and straightforward paper which makes its argument simply and well. Essentially it shows that implementation research (IR) should consider IR as a social rather than as an invasive clinical intervention, and therefore that the norms governing it should be those governing research in social science and management research, rather than those of biomedical research. This weakens requirements of informed consent while retaining a focus on quality in research and on the integrity of researchers and communities. The only weakness of the argument is that the authors do not engage with the law. For instance, it is statutory rules rather than ethical guidelines which restrict data processing. But since these rules vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, it is reasonable that an article for an international audience would not cover the law in detail.

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.