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May 12th, 2014

Dr. Susan Michie  
University College London  
United Kingdom  
Associate Editor  
*Implementation Science*

**Re: Resubmission of manuscript entitled:** Operationalizing the RE-AIM framework to evaluate the impact of multi-sector partnerships (MS: 1404012361111360)

Dear Dr. Michie,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity submit a second revision of our manuscript entitled “Operationalizing the RE-AIM framework to evaluate the impact of multi-sector partnerships” (MS: 1404012361111360).

Please find a detailed, point-by-point description of how we addressed the reviewers’ concerns below my signature. All changes made to the manuscript are in red font. The reviewers’ comments are underlined whereas our responses are in regular font to help differentiate our responses from the comments.

This manuscript remains original and has not been previously published. These data are not under consideration for publication elsewhere. This manuscript will not be submitted elsewhere until a final decision is made regarding its acceptability for publication in *Implementation Science*. Finally, all authors have no competing interests to declare.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you any other questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

Shane N. Sweet, PhD  
Assistant Professor  
Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education  
McGill University  
475 Pine Ave W  
Montreal, Qc  
H2W1S4

Corresponding author: Shane N. Sweet; Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, McGill University, 475 Pine Ave W, Montreal, Qc, H2W1S4  
Tel: 514-398-4184 x:09903; email: shane.sweet@mcgill.ca
Response to reviewers' comments

Reviewer: Caroline Finch

Reviewer's report:

1. This is an excellent paper that will be very useful for the field.
   Thank you for the compliment.

Discretionary Revisions

2. Page 5, line 17. Requires a reference number after “Finch and Donaldson”.
The reference number was added

3. Page 9, line 22. Sentences (both here and throughout the manuscript e.g. line 18, page 17) should not start with abbreviations.
   Please note that SCI Action Canada is the actual name of the organization, not Spinal Cord Injury Action Canada. In these instances SCI is technically not an abbreviation but part of the organization’s name. As a result, no changes were made.

4. Page 13. Use small n, not capital N for sample size, throughout the manuscript.
The N to n was changed throughout the manuscript except the N = 85,556 because that represents the population.

5. Page 14, lines 20-21. Wording suggestion: “… benefit of using this strategic approach is more in line …”
   We have slightly changed the wording of this sentence as the reviewers helped us realize that the sentence was not as clear as it could be.

6. Page 18, line 14. “literature” not “literatures”
   This change was made.

7. Page 19, line 12. “in our RE-AIM” may read better than “to our RE-AIM”
   This change was made.

8. Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field
   Thank you for the compliment.
**Reviewer:** Lourdes Planas

**Reviewer's report:**

No further comments

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Thank you for the compliment.