

Reviewer's report

Title: Guideline implementation: an exploratory investigation using psychological theory

Version: 1 **Date:** 13 September 2006

Reviewer: Lisa Klesges

Reviewer's report:

General

This paper reports results aimed at identifying potential implementation problems from a multi-perspective behavioral theory approach. Specific application to family interventions for schizophrenia is described. Results may aid work to further the theoretical perspectives available to design interventions and evaluate guideline implementation research.

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

1. In Methods, description of the transcript scoring is unclear. Was each comment considered for its semantic/conceptual relevance to a particular theoretical construct being probed? If so, this is not well described.
2. How was coding for multiple statements within a domain considered? Was each comment within a domain given a score or a score awarded based on a global impression for that domain? The number of comments elicited for each probe would be informative as well.
3. A "0" score appears to be awarded for no comments or for comments that reflected a problem. Can authors justify the coding? A lack of thoughts or comments seems to reflect a potential lack of knowledge or opinion which is a different matter than a view that identifies a problem.
If scoring approach is not modified, this potential interpretational issue should be added as a potential limitation to the interpretation of results.

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

1. The title would be more clear if it is specified what type of guideline (e.g., mental health, medical) is under study.
2. In the Abstract, please edit the first sentence of the Objectives. It is long and unclear. In particular the leading phrase implies that you are using an existing theoretical framework when indeed it appears you are assembling a new framework.
3. The transition on page 5 moving from description of the theory-based implementation interview to discussion of specific barriers in mental health seems abrupt. Was the previous TBII developed with all diseases and conditions in mind? Is the purpose of the current study to develop an entirely new theoretical approach for mental health or to modify the existing framework? Please clarify.
4. Please clarify the sampling. Three out of how many total NHS Trusts available? Are the three included similar to those not in terms of size, patient characteristics, etc.
5. Similarly, were the CMHTs selected similar to those not included in potential confounding factors? Were members of the teams agreeing to participate similar to those not participating on demographic factors? Some description along these lines would help evaluate the generalizability of the study conclusions.
6. How were the inclusionary/exclusionary criteria verified? e.g., by interviewing an administrator or by survey?
7. Further details on the interview procedures would be helpful. Who conducted the interviews? During the interview, were any clarifications requested or feedback given other than the global questions?
8. In describing the transcript analyses, it would be helpful to know the background of the raters. Level of training, experience with mental health, etc. Were they specifically trained on interpretation of the coding criteria?
9. In Results, problems of time and supervision are described. Were these specifically probed or uncovered in further analyses of comments?
10. In Discussion, 4th line of page 12, please list the domains associated with greater difficulty.
11. In line 6 of page 12, regarding reference #21. What were family interventions being implemented for? That is what condition or disease?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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.