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Reviewer's report:

General comments

This paper reports on the development of a quantitative theory-based instrument to measure the self-reported organizational readiness for delivering evidence based practice in community level chronic disease prevention programs. The instrument was evaluated on psychometric properties involving construct development and internal consistency, and construct validity (?) among a population of stakeholders (n=243, response rate 70%) related to 19 organisations. Test-retest reliability was assessed among a subset of 92 respondents.

Organizational readiness for change is an important but often neglected determinant for successful implementation.

Major comments

1) The underlying assumption in this paper is the importance and relevance of tailoring dissemination and implementation strategies to stages of change (Roger Diffusion of Innovations). This is one way to define organisational readiness? Many models have been published reporting on important barriers and facilitators for implementation, with organisational related factors. Damschroder has e.g. tried to integrate various models. The authors could reflect on why they took Rogers as their theory of choice.


2) Study participants in methods section. I understand that 243 respondents stemmed from many institutions. The obesity program respondents already stem from 19 different institutions. How many respondents did you have per institution? Did you find large variations or expected clustering within respondents of one institution? Should you have corrected for inter-cluster variation?

In the discussion it says that in many cases there was only one respondent per organization. This could be a major flaw in measuring organizational readiness.
As we do not know yet “how many respondent it takes” per organization to measure these issues. We need to know this before you can recommend your survey instrument for broader use.

Minor comments

1) In the methods section “measures” we learn that the authors also refer to a study published by Steckler (ref 18), who developed a 125 items questionnaire to measure diffusion. I do not know whether Steckler is related to Rogers’ theory or to any other models.

2) In the methods section “measures” you refer to appendix A for the 26-item (?) full survey instrument. The instrument in Appendix A adds up to 23 items: 20 items for the domains and 3 for the additional contextual variable. I assume that table 3 shows the deleted items in the final model? But I do not understand which "two error covariance" were added?

3) In the analyses you state that a university affiliation would correlate with organisational climate. Can you clarify your hypothesis? Is this used for validation (construct validation)?

4) Was the analysis as reported in table 5 also meant to contribute to construct validation?

5) I doubt if an ICC of 0.50 for test-retest reliability deserve the qualification of “moderate”.

Discretionary revisions

none

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