

Reviewer's report

Title: QUERI Series: The Role of Organizational Research in Implementing Evidence-based Practice: VA QUERI Examples and Applications

Version: 2 Date: 1 October 2007

Reviewer: Martin Eccles

Reviewer's report:

Dear Dr Yano,

Thank you for re-submitting your article in the QUERI Series and for your comprehensive letter of response to our and the reviewers comments. In the light of this there are some further change we would like you to make to the article.

These are based on the track changes version of the manuscript.

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

We had some problems with the second half of the discussion. Extolling the virtues of the VA system is really not that helpful - we would rather a synthesis of what has been learned about the role of organizational factors in VA implementation (examples are given in the paper from various projects but what are the generalizable findings the rest of us should take on board?). Can the paper end on a note describing what QUERI has done in the way of advancing knowledge about the role of organization in implementation- i.e. the key lessons- (and not methods for eliciting data on organisational factors but what organisational factors are important under what circumstances)?

We struggle to find Figure 1 useful or have a clear idea of or what figure 1 is supposedly illustrating. So ... you either have to make it absolutely clear or we think that you should remove it.

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

P4, Para 1. we are not sure that the greater understanding is always central (as implied) – consider softening slightly to something like “can be relevant” or “can be important”.

“Individually or in combination, these structures (e.g., size, staffing) and processes (e.g., practice arrangements, decision support) are likely ...” – again suggest a slight softening to something like “have the potential to”.

“Unfortunately, much implementation research has failed to fully recognize or adequately address the influence and importance of health care organizational factors, which may pose risks to ...” suggest replace “pose risks to” with

“compromise”.

P5 Heading “Role of organisational factors...” – we think this is probably more accurately written as the role of organisational factors in QUERI model of implementation research.

P7 the phrase “especially given the ... the VA” sounds slightly grudging and should probably be deleted.

P12 “Structural measures also represent ...”. I think this should be the other way round - Governance, managerial or professional arrangements for overseeing ... also represent structural measures.

P15. There is a fair degree of duplication between the text and Table 4. Could you double check this to ensure that this is kept to a minimum. Ideally I’d like the text to sign the readers way around Table 4 and not to reproduce the text.

P18. Suggest replace “fielded” with “conducted”.

P21. Suggest add “intervention” between key and components.

Table 3. I don’t think that dividing the QUERI steps by PDSA helps and suggest that you remove the sub-headings.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Additional more general comments that you may find useful.

P7 - Organisational theory and conceptual frameworks - apart from this paragraph there is no real discussion of 'key' organisational theories in the paper. It would be helpful to the naïve reader if you could add some discussion of what the organisational theories are that should be informing implementation research.

We had some difficulty sorting out whether you are talking about organizational factors or system factors (which often are organizational factors but not always- e.g. the section on organizational outcomes seem often more system outcomes rather than organizational outcomes) - perhaps this is just semantics. We were left thinking it is not really clear what organizational and system factors are.

Table 2- is there a reason that organizational outcomes are not included in the table?

Martin Eccles & Ian Graham

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: Acceptable

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