Reviewer’s report

Title: Advancing the Application, Quality and Harmonization of Implementation Science Measures

Version: 3 Date: 12 October 2012

Reviewer: Cara Lewis

Reviewer’s report:

RE: Revised MS: 1359409465748507 “Advancing the Application, Quality, and Harmonization of Implementation Science Measures”

The authors present a revised version of their manuscript describing an innovative approach to enhancing the quality and potential for harmonizing measures relevant for implementation science. It is this reviewer’s perspective that the manuscript is much improved in its current form given the careful attention the authors paid to improving clarity and transparency of the purpose, method, results, and future directions. Clarifications to improve transparency such as requiring posts and ratings to link to names allows for greater appreciation for this particular method.

As the authors noted in their response to reviewers, a “meta-issue” was flagged by this reviewer, which manifested in many smaller, more specific clarification issues. I do appreciate the authors taking the time to respond to what might have seemed like redundant points made as the small revisions in the manuscript are key to accurately communicating the author’s undertaking of this critical unmet need in the field of implementation science. So it was not this reviewer’s intention to recommend a systematic review approach, but rather to pay close attention to the framing of the study and findings. As such, with the improved transparency of the manuscript in its current form, it is clear that the project and manuscript are contributions in their own right.

Major Compulsory Revisions

None

Minor Essential Revisions

The revised manuscript would benefit from a careful read to address grammatical errors. The following are some of the identified errors: an extra space in the 3rd sentence on page 8; an extra comma in the 3rd to last sentence on page 12; an extra period in the last sentence of the 2nd paragraph as well as the 2nd sentence of the 3rd paragraph on page 18; an extra word (“to”) in the last sentence of the 3rd paragraph on page 18; incorrect verb ending (adding versus add) in 1st sentence of 2nd paragraph on page 20.

Discretionary Revisions
The authors might consider breaking up their description of the 4-step process in the introduction on page 7 (e.g., First, … Second, …) as opposed to including all details in a single sentence using a numbered list as there is simply a lot of information to digest.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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