

## **Author's response to reviews**

**Title:** A conceptual framework for implementation fidelity

### **Authors:**

Christopher Carroll ([c.carroll@shef.ac.uk](mailto:c.carroll@shef.ac.uk))  
Malcolm Patterson ([m.patterson@shef.ac.uk](mailto:m.patterson@shef.ac.uk))  
Stephen Wood ([s.j.wood@shef.ac.uk](mailto:s.j.wood@shef.ac.uk))  
Andrew Booth ([a.booth@shef.ac.uk](mailto:a.booth@shef.ac.uk))  
Jo Rick ([jo.rick@shef.ac.uk](mailto:jo.rick@shef.ac.uk))  
Shashi Balain ([s.balain@shef.ac.uk](mailto:s.balain@shef.ac.uk))

**Version:** 4 **Date:** 18 October 2007

### **Author's response to reviews:**

To the editor

References in the text have been put in square brackets and numbers are no longer superscript, in accordance with format.

References were not generated automatically.

Where available, Index Medicus journal abbreviations have been used in the list of references.

Referee 1 (Jill Francis)

Discretionary revisions:

1. The first sentence of the Discussion section has now been omitted to limit the repetitiveness of the abstract.
2. This sentence has now been omitted; it was unnecessary as the previous sentence made the point clearly.
3. Font checked
4. Second full stop removed.
5. Line added to clarify (p.9); i.e. how far those responsible for delivering an intervention actually adhere to the intervention as it is outlined by its designers
6. References amended

Referee 2 (Marlies Hulscher)

General

Suggested structure has been used

Minor essential revisions

1. Rationale for additional elements has been moved to the end of the paragraph on p.8.
2. N/A
3. Thank you for this excellent reference ; it has been cited in the discussion relating to identifying and intervention ;s most important elements on pp.7 and 8.
4. We felt that it was necessary to establish the importance of each of the different elements of the framework first, before describing issues relating to measurement, so we have retained the paragraph in its original place.
5. N/A.