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Reviewer’s report:

General

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

This is a very detailed report of the development of an implementation intervention to assist substance abuse clinics in adopting guideline-based practices for treating depression. However, no question is posed or addressed by the article and no data are presented; as currently written, it is therefore not suitable as a journal article.

Whilst there is a considerable amount of practical detail, the article would be strengthened by more detail about how the empirical and theoretical literature it drew on were used to decide and develop the intervention components. If a systematic, replicable method was used to move from theory and evidence to the intervention, reporting this would be an important aspect of the paper. It is currently written at a descriptive rather than analytic level. More detail is also needed about the evaluation strategies: e.g. what are the research questions, what is the study design, what measures are included?

Another issue that should be addressed is the context and generalisability of the intervention. The country and specific circumstances in which the intervention has been developed is not described (although addresses of the authors suggest it was the USA). What aspects of this intervention are likely to be relevant to other developed and developing countries? What is new about this intervention? What are the “main messages” of this article?

There are assumptions about readers’ knowledge e.g. the first paragraph of the abstract refers to VW, QUERI and Phase 2 without explaining what these mean. The article could be considerably shortened by cutting out repetition and redundancy, and writing in more concise style.

The article states that data about implementation, adoption and sustainability will be presented in future. My view is that the description of current process should be shortened and presented alongside future data about whether or not the intervention improved implementation. However, this submission is aimed at a Special Issue, and it may be that a shortened article taking into account the above comments would be appropriate within this context.

Typos "care" missing after "primary" on p.7; were should be where on p.12; comment should be commented on p.14

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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