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Reviewer’s report:

General Comments
Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to review the above. Sound evaluations of the implementation of the PW are to be welcomed and I am particularly pleased to see Saskatchewan’s implementation reported here. It is timely, bearing in mind other implementation studies going on in the UK and Ireland and should add to our understanding of ‘bottom-up’ QI. The question, as posed in the title is well defined, the general standard of writing is acceptable and the authors acknowledge many of the limitations in their study. Having said that I think this manuscript does have some difficulties in fully addressing the question in terms of background detail and has a number of anomalies in the reporting and analysis of the data which they will need to address before it can proceed to publication.
I address my queries in detail below by referencing to the line numbers in the manuscript I received

Major Compulsory Revisions
133 When was it tested. This is important as the dates don’t appear to collate accurately
137 This needs further clarity, eg. did everyone who volunteered get to start? Is there a possibility that some didn’t get to start and are included within this study group? It would be important to know how participants were nominated / ‘volunteered (eg. By manager/executive/staff-themselves)
362 The timelines as presented here to look credible, in relation to the implementation of 5 modules in the time line described. Earlier in the ‘intervention’ piece the authors indicated that they started in Sept 2011. May 2012 is only 8 months – timeline also needs to be reviewed in table A. If the authors are seriously contending that all 5 modules were done then more detailed explication will be required as to how this was achieved within such a short time frame.
448 Again the timelines don’t add up. Sept 2011 - May 2012 = 8 months
475 Its stated that the unit ended RTC in December 2011, having only started in Sept 2011. Again some explanation is required or there an error has been made in reporting the time lines.
Minor Essential Revisions

76- 78 This statement is not necessarily true in ALL QI projects, it is however said to be true for all QI start-ups. Also the statement seems to anticipate the findings? If anticipation is the case the authors will need to indicate upon what they based their anticipation. (Minor essential revision)

85 RTC was was developed in 2005 & 2006 and launched in 2007. On a number of occasions in the manuscript the authors make this error (eg. 131) (Minor Essential revision)

86 Only reference 11 alludes to any other international implementation outside of the UK

115-120 Material presented here would look so much better in a graph or table so the reader could keep referring back

125 Please indicate what type of analysis

159 Defining the grades/professions/ward teams within the Saskatchewan system is important to help international readers understand the background context of staff as well as providing organisational detail

161 Some more detail required in relation to the criteria used for purposive sampling; particularly as it is referred to as an issue in the limitations.

214 The reader really needs to understand why only 2 were chosen and what criterion was used?

218 Should this not be part of the 'Sample' section?

233 'Knowing How You’re Doing’ needs further explanation for the non-RTC reader

239 This piece needs some re-structuring, perhaps by using subheadings from the framework as it is very difficult to follow

552 The authors need to explain what a ‘readiness grid’ is or provide an example and reference it

577 Why transformational leadership? Davis & Adam mention it as a type of transformational leadership but White et al. are misquoted here. They say it just impacts on leadership.

714 Reference is incomplete

748 Reference appears incomplete
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