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Implementation Science Review

TITLE: The relationship between baseline organizational readiness to change assessment subscale scores and implementation of hepatitis prevention services in substance use disorders treatment clinics

OVERALL:

The authors’ objective was to assess the relationship between baseline organizational readiness to change assessment (ORCA) scores and a hepatitis prevention program implementation in clinics. To examine how an organization’s readiness to change would affect program implementation is an interesting research question that contributes to current literature on organizational change and is of interest to the audience of this journal. However, this study has some serious limitations in terms of the sample and data.

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

BACKGROUND:

The authors offered good and concise descriptions of the Promoting Action on Research Implementation in Health Services (PARIHS) framework and ORCA. This section may be enhanced with a brief discussion of organizational change and why it is an important topic in the study of implementation. It would also be helpful to include a table that includes all the items that make up the ORCA scales and correspond to the text on page 6.

METHODS:

This section can be strengthened with more details.

1. Sample and Data Collection:

It seemed that the authors had a convenience sample, which does bias their findings and limit their generalizability. It would be helpful if the authors would provide some basic descriptive information on the participants or the teams. Is there information available about the VA facilities in which the participating teams
work? The larger environment in which the teams operate may lend insights into the success or the process of implementation.

In terms of data collection, who answered the needs assessment questionnaire? Did everyone on the team do so and if so, were the scores averaged to generate a team score? Although the authors addressed this in the results section, the methods section would be the appropriate place to explain how the implementation scores were calculated. Were data collected at the training session? If so, were they taped or captured by observers?

2. Analysis

More information is needed about data analysis. What are the variables on which implementation efforts were measured? Also, it seems that data were collected at 4 time points. What did the authors do with the longitudinal data (e.g., how were they used)? It will be helpful to have a more detailed description of the effect size calculations.

RESULTS:

The presentation of the results is clear.

DISCUSSION:

In paragraph 2 of this section, the authors seemed to discuss findings (the association between characteristics of team leaders and implementation) that were not reported in the results section. This is confusing.

The discussion about the inverse relationship between resource and implementation should be strengthened. In particular, the authors offered no possible explanation about this relationship. If information about these VA facilities is available, it may be possible to explore or make some hypotheses about the impact of organizational structure or culture on this relationship.

The discussion on limitations is good in illustrating the major concerns of this study. With these fairly severe limitations, it is suggested that the authors articulate for the reader the contributions of this study or implications of their findings.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Again, it would be helpful to add a table listing the items in the ORCA scales. If the information is available, the authors may consider adding a table describing the teams or offer some characteristics of the VA facilities in which the teams are situated.
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