

Reviewer's report

Title: A theory of organizational readiness for change

Version: 1 **Date:** 5 April 2009

Reviewer: Anne Sales

Reviewer's report:

General: I think this is an important, generally well written paper that provides a very useful perspective on a topic that has not, as yet, had much clarity. While I do not agree in all respects with the position stated by the author, I think that this paper opens up a debate that has potential for moving the field of implementation science forward.

Major compulsory revisions: none

Minor essential revisions: there are typographical errors scattered through the text, some of which make it a little difficult to follow the logic and intent of the text. I think this needs a careful proofing read.

Discretionary revisions:

1. While this paper provides an important position statement, it doesn't fully review the literature on change focused on implementing innovation. Almost all the literature referred to in this paper is based on work in the United States, but there is a significant literature on change processes in organizations in the United Kingdom, and more scattered literature from other countries. While I don't consider that this has to be addressed, I think that Dr. Weiner should at least consider this omitted literature, and consider whether there is merit in at least referring to it, if only to say that it's outside the scope of his review. I think that some of this literature provides some counter-point to the assertions he makes in this paper. On the other hand, I would expect some of the authors of this literature, especially those in the UK, to respond to this paper, which would facilitate the debate that this paper can stimulate. As a result, I don't think it's essential that he take this on.

2. The diagram provided in the figure is very helpful, but I'm not sure the text tracks it as closely as I think it might. I think it may be helpful to use headers within the text that correspond to the items in the diagram-- particularly those in the second column boxes, which are the focus of this paper. I think that this may help organize the paper a little more clearly.

3. While I fully appreciate that the focus of this paper is supra-individual-- and I fully endorse that-- the lack of discussion about some of the dominant individual level theories of behavior change make this paper a little less relevant than I think it could be. I think some discussion of the Theory of Planned Behavior, and how this theory (or others if Dr. Weiner feels there is strong evidence to support

other individual level theories of behavior change) could inform or be juxtaposed against the theory of organizational readiness to change that he posits, and would be interesting. Again, however, I think it's likely that this paper will stimulate others to do this reflection and juxtaposition, so it is not necessary that he take this on.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:

I have no financial competing interests. This paper is in an area of particular interest to me, and I am likely (in collaboration with colleagues) to be interested in participating in debate stimulated by this paper. I don't consider this to be a conflict, but I recognize that I have a particular interest in this topic. Overall, this motivates me to recommend relatively quick publication of this paper so that the debate can follow. This may constitute a form of academic conflict of interest, but I don't think it's a major one, and I certainly have no reason to conceal it.