

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Innovations in mental health services implementation: A report on state-level data from the National Evidence-Based Practices Project

**Version:** 2 **Date:** 3 February 2006

**Reviewer:** Paula Michelle Whitty

### Reviewer's report:

General

The author has made major improvements to the manuscript, and has responded adequately to most of the content of the reviews. The author has also made a valiant attempt to respond to my concerns about the application of the Greenhalgh definition of 'innovation' in this context. However, my opinion on this continues to differ from the author's: while I agree that the activities identified in the study might be 'novel' (and also planned and coordinated), they are not directed at improving outcomes, cost effectiveness, efficiency etc. Rather, they are directed at supporting the implementation of the EBPs, which are directed at improving outcomes, cost effectiveness etc. I have suggested a solution to this below, as I think the activities could be more accurately described as novel or 'innovative implementation activities' to overcome my objection here. Finally, given the author makes it clear in her covering letter that the study did not attempt to address the effectiveness or success of the activities identified, the conclusion (in both abstract and main conclusion) that 'states....can use the innovations identified to plan, jump start or enhance...' seems premature.

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

1. When referring to the novel activities or strategies identified in the study, use the term 'innovative implementation activities' or strategies (shortened to 'innovative activities' later). Also clarify that the application of the Greenhalgh definition applies only to two out of three parts (as above).
2. Remove the conclusions about using the innovations to 'plan, jump-start or enhance...'.

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

None

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Capitalisation on 'EBPS' not completely removed in the revised manuscript.

**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.