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11 March 2013
Dr. Denise O’Connor

Implementation Science Editorial Team

MS:1037921551806294: Guideline adaptation and implementation planning: a prospective observational study.

Dear Dr. O’Connor

We would like to thank you for the additional feedback and agree that the suggested changes will strengthen our manuscript.

In response, we have endeavoured to address each comment in the Addendum that follows this letter. In general, major additions and edited sections are highlighted in grey in this version of the manuscript. Full editing of document to tighten sentence structure has enabled a substantial reduction in word count; these changes have not been marked.

We trust that this next version responds to the revisions requested and we look forward to your feedback.

Sincerely,

M. Harrison

Professor, School of Nursing
Director, Queen’s Joanna Briggs Collaboration and
Scientific Director, Practice and Research in Nursing Group
ADDENDUM: RESPONSE TO EDITOR

Manuscript ID 1037921551806294
Guideline adaptation and implementation planning: a prospective observational study.

Requested changes are shaded in the main document.

1) The revised manuscript no longer contains an abstract (the version sent for peer review did). Please include the abstract and ensure both the abstract and paper adhere to Implementation Science word count requirements (e.g. abstract no longer than 350 wds, manuscript no longer than 6000 words) and that the abstract addresses peer review comments (eg Hutchinson).

An oversight on our part – apologies; abstract is re-inserted, pp. 2-3. Word count = 351. We edited and tightened the manuscript for improved clarity and reduced word count. Including suggested additions to content, the body of the paper has been revised to 6,464 words (vs, previous submission at 7325 words). An additional 70 words could be saved taking out our initial quotes in background but we believe they set the stage for the paper. Other than that we believe further cuts would compromise the integrity of the reporting. A separate file has been provided to expand on the data management element and provide tools that we used.

2) The background section does not delineate 'customization' from 'tailoring' and 'adaptation' (see Stetler's comments). Please address.

We thought we had clarified terms in the last submission by rephrasing and indicating we had used them interchangeably. For better clarity this round, language is adjusted to use only 'customization’ of guidelines when referring to adaptation, p.5,6.

3) Given the change to the title and to be consistent with the objectives stated on page 7 of the revised manuscript, should the text in the last paragraph of the background say the following? "...the experience of Canadian cancer care groups undertaking guideline adaptation and implementation planning...."?

Done, and moved forward to p.5.

4) The revised Data Analysis section refers to other publications arising from this partnership project (e.g. Fervers, Dogherty etc). These publications should be introduced briefly in the background and a clear statement made about what this manuscript adds/how it differs.

A small addition to the Background section outlining the other publications has been added (p.8). This should clarify the distinction. Note - the Fervers et al. paper does not arise from this project, only the facilitation study by Dogherty.

5) The section on Data Collection (Methods) does not adequately cover how objectives 3 & 4 (pg 7) were addressed. For example, site visits, structured interviews and a forum are mentioned in the revised manuscript (and focus groups mentioned in abstract from previous version of the manuscript) but there is little discussion about the conduct and content of these (e.g. questions for structured interviews; site visit data collection checklist, agenda for forum etc). This should be covered in more detail and related documents (e.g. interview guide) appended in the additional files.

To further address the data collection and analysis elements, we have appended an additional file, ‘Procedures’, containing protocols and data forms related to the semi-structured, process audit interviews and final forum (noted on p. 11 and p. 27). ‘Focus groups’ was removed from abstract, p.2, (related to separate, embedded facilitation study only)
6) The Data Analysis section also does not adequately cover how objectives 3 and 4 were addressed. A description of how the data was analysed to address all objectives should be included (e.g. how interview/site visit/forum data analysed to inform results on participant perspectives).

Additional comments describing Data Collection and Data Analysis methods have been added to pp.11,12.

7) The subheadings in Results should be presented in the same order as per objectives (page 7) to help the reader navigate the manuscript. Currently 'implementation action..' comes before 'participant perspectives' which is different to objectives) and preferably with consistent wording (e.g. 'Process and steps undertaken in guideline adaptation and implementation planning', 'Facilitation, resources and support', 'Participant and key stakeholder perspectives', 'Implementation activity during the adaptation process')

Done, pp. 13, 14, 18, 19; items 3 and 4 were reversed and subtitles modified to better align with objectives.

8) A section on limitations has been added in the revised manuscript although this does not discuss the methods you used to collect and analyse the data. Could you reflect on this and comment on any limitations as relevant?

The limitations section, p. 21-21 was revised to expand on subjective nature of self-reports.

9) The Discussion contains quite a bit of material on CAN-IMPLEMENT. While it is appropriate to state that the findings of this study has led to the creation of CAN-IMPLEMENT, I think only a brief description should be provided here and you should point readers to the website for more information (i.e. remove paras 4-7). A section on how the findings from this study relate to other relevant research would be a useful addition to this section.

Done, p.21-22. Regarding relevant literature - we did run a search for additional literature on adaptation. Two papers were found on ADAPTE but did not seem relevant to this paper. The recent review of Kaiser Permanente's National Guideline Program methodological processes (includes ADAPTE) 2012 "Transparency Matters" was about their body, the Care Management Institute, responsible for guidelines i.e. similar to guideline panels. The other was a Spanish language report on adaptation methodology for a community-acquired pneumonia guideline (used ADAPTE) which we were not able to translate.

10) Consider removing the word 'Canadian' in the first sentence of the Conclusion (e.g. 'This study provides...'). Done, p.22