Reviewer's report:

This manuscript reports on the process of translating evidence-based cancer-focused interventions into community settings. The authors describe their process in detail and provide lessons learned for others interested in pursuing this type of approach.

Although interesting and informative, I do not think that this manuscript is suitable for publication in the journal Implementation Science. The description of the process presented herein is not particularly innovative; much has been written on processes for translating evidence-based interventions into community settings. I recommend that the authors consider the suggestions outlined below, revise as they see appropriate, and consider submitting the manuscript to a more specialty journal in public health/community engagement (e.g., Evaluation and Program Planning; cancer prevention/education specialty journal).

Major Compulsory Revisions

• The contribution of this article to the evidence base in implementation science is unclear. The authors should consider significantly reducing the introductory text; most readers in this field are familiar with the problem of lack of dissemination and implementation of evidence-based interventions, confusion over use of various terms, and efforts to reduce the research-to-practice gap.

• The authors should explicate their rationale for using in-person vs. web-based training approaches, and hypothesize which approach they believe to be more effective at changing CHAs’ behavior (e.g., increased fidelity to intervention components?). Has this type of manipulation been conducted already in the field? What are the results and how do those findings inform predictions in the present study? The approach needs to be situated within the context of other published findings that may manipulate the type of technical assistance and training provided to community health workers.

• Unclear what results are actually being presented in this manuscript. Might consider waiting for outcomes of the full trial and then report whether or not differences were found between the two training conditions.

• Unclear what contribution this manuscript makes to the evidence base in implementation science. The lessons learned approach is helpful, but there are many such articles already published that speak to these same issues. The authors need to demonstrate—via review of the literature—that their lessons
learned and their approach is different, unique and makes an important contribution to our collective knowledge on how to translate interventions into real-world settings. How is this approach different than others? How is it unique? How does it differ from other articles on lessons learned?

Minor Essential Revisions

• The manuscript could be significantly shorter. Much of the information presented in the introduction is unnecessary.

Discretionary Revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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