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Dear Professor Michie,

Attached please find our second revised manuscript (MS: 9108965106473982) entitled, “Measurement of a model of implementation for health care: Toward a testable theory” for consideration for publication in Implementation Science. We thank the Reviewers again for their constructive feedback. We address their remaining questions and concerns below.

Reviewer 1 – Jill Francis

1. We thank the Reviewer for her detailed example of text deemed more appropriate for the Results section of the Abstract and use a slightly adapted version of this in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer 2 – Rebecca Lawton

1. We added the comma on page four after innovations.

Reviewer 3 – Laura Damschroder

1. We emphasized in two places in the text (i.e., abstract and conclusions) that we developed a mixed-methods approach of measurement.

2. We inserted the Reviewers’ rewrite of our paragraph.

3. We have included a full list of survey items and interview guide as supplemental files.

4. We aligned the sections of the results in the manuscript with Table 1.

5. We now clarify that we adopted the concept the subjective/identity for our definition and measurement of cosmopolitan.
6. We removed the sentence on professional social networks under Adopter Characteristics as we cover it in more detail under Communication and Influence.

7. We rewrote the two sentences on social networks and peer opinion leaders.

8. Although in our previous manuscript, we had mistakenly only included external influences, in our survey items we had included both internal and external boundary spanners. We now correct this in the manuscript.

9. We understand that the limited information on change agents typically refers to external individuals who facilitate or coach an organization. Typically we view an internal change agent as more of a champion. However in our NIMH investigation, there are several national key change agents who also run their own VA PTSD residential programs. So in this case we would view them as a change agent nationally as well as a change agent locally.

10. We changed our definition of homophily to the degree to which providers have similar professional and educational backgrounds and theoretical orientation. We have adjusted our measurement accordingly.

11. We changed the labels from a focus on roles to a focus on opinions (i.e., peer opinion leader instead of peer opinion; expert opinion to expert opinion leader). We note that there appear to be different types of opinion leaders.

12. In our previous revision, we removed all of the operational definitions from the manuscript and included these in the table. Thus, we hesitated to fully describe, compare and contrast change agent, expert opinion, and peer opinion in the text. However we now clarify in the text that these constructs are used inconsistently and synonymously as well as further delineate the definitions in the table.

13. We are delighted that the Reviewer agrees with our first sentence under System Antecedents.

14. We now clarify that we are talking about organizational structure and its sub-constructs. In addition, the table, figure and manuscript are now aligned.

15. The relationship between change agent and decentralization is noted in Table 1.

16. We have re-ordered all of the constructs to match Table 1 and more clearly differentiate constructs from sub-constructs.

17. In our systematic literature review of existing measures, we could not find one for incentives and mandates. Thus we created our own and examples are in the table.

18. We use the Reviewers’ example of how environmental stability overlaps with inner context.
19. In the previous revision, we had noted in the table that internal communication and external collaboration were derived from interview questions. What we wrote in the text was incorrect and is now removed.

20. We clarify that more research is needed to test Greenhalgh et al.’s model using our quantitative and qualitative measures.

21. In the only footnote, we now include that Assimilation was one of the few constructs (or sub-constructs) that was not formally measured. We took out the sentence on “soft periphery” in the text as it is a sub-construct under Assimilation.

22. We do not feel that citation 2 and 3 are duplicates of one another. There is a 31 year time span between these two sources and much had changed between the first and fifth edition of these books.

23. We edited the sentence on team consensus.

24. There was a footnote 2 in the previous manuscript. However there was no line break between footnote 1 and 2. Perhaps that was why the Reviewer was unable to view it. In the previous manuscript, we said, “2 A copy of the full survey and interview are available upon request to the first author.” However this has been deleted as the Reviewer asked for a full survey and interview to be included as supplemental materials.

25. In Table 1, we put “N/A” for all blank cells.

26. We moved the last sentence under Methods to the first paragraph under Results.

27. We have now listed manuals/materials in the operational definition for technical support in Table 1.

28. We changed “adopter” in Table 1 to “Adopter Characteristics” for consistency with text.

29. We removed the very last sentence under Adopter characteristics (referring to tenure and skills) and integrated the information with our prior comments on these constructs.

30. We no longer refer to Greenhalgh’s model as “parsimonious.”

We hope our manuscript now meets with your acceptance and standards.
We thank you further for considering our manuscript for publication in the *Implementation Science*. All correspondences should be directed to me via telephone 203-856-2782 or e-mail: Joan.Cook@yale.edu.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Joan

Joan M. Cook, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Yale School of Medicine
Department of Psychiatry