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Reviewer's report:

General
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 a small number of further changes we would like you to make to the article.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
None.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
We have thought about your title and think that it would be more accurately titled QUERI Series: The process of developing an implementation intervention. This accurately describes the content of the paper. Page 3. In response to the first set of comments you have re-titled the processes you describe as ‘Formative Evaluation’ and ‘Development Panels’. Bearing in mind that the paper is about intervention development (and much more clearly so than before) we don’t think that ‘Formative Evaluation’ is the right term. Whilst it does occur elsewhere in the series it would not normally be extended to cover the process of intervention development but be used to describe a (more or less wide) range of activities that occur after an intervention is commenced. However in Europe and Canada the activities that you have titled Formative Evaluation would routinely be termed ‘Diagnostic Evaluation’ and so we would like you to use this term instead.
Page 15. At the top of the page you talk of ‘screeners’ who can be electronic or paper. It is not clear what is being referred to. Could you expand the terms to make them descriptive of the process they fulfill? Page 16 paragraph 1. The notion of a quick referral is unclear. Do you mean ‘urgent’ (implying both need and timing) or a referral that results in an early appointment through administrative arrangements but irrespective of need? Page 18 paragraph 2 line 4. You use the word ‘trial’ which generates an expectation in a scientific readership. We think that you should change this to ‘study’. We are aware that you have drawn on the QUERI Framework term and the issue of the use of this term in the QUERI Framework has been raised with Drs Mittman and Stetler. Page 20 Conclusions line 1. Suggest replace ‘implementation’ with ‘intervention’. Same line replace ‘an optional’ with ‘a’. Table 2. Though it is a small point we don’t understand how you can use the term ‘randomised’ to describe your design. There does not appear to be any process of randomization involved. If we are correct in this then the word should be removed. The first sentence in the Development Panels row second column does not quite make sense.
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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.