Reviewer’s report

Title: A systematic review of implementation frameworks of innovations in healthcare and resulting generic implementation framework

Version: 1 Date: 7 November 2014

Reviewer: Susanne Kaae

Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions:
I think the paper shows a convincingly piece of analysis and knowledge of implementation literature. However, I think also that the paper could be strengthened by clarifying/ highlighting the purpose of the analysis and how readers in particular practitioners could benefit from reading it. Further, as the paper is packed with implementation terminology I think it would help readers considerably by providing more examples of the especially the results (please see below).

Suggestions for improvement:
Abstract: I think the aim should be highlighted – right now there is hardly one, except: ‘As such it is plausible that not all frameworks include the full range of concepts now thought to be involved in implementation’. I think however more argumentation is needed for why the study was conducted.

Background: Please describe/ explain why you focused on implementation literature from health care. Please argue further for the relevance for the study by explaining how the reader could use the results of ‘do implementation frameworks across the range of innovations in healthcare consist of the same concepts, and if not, how do they vary?’ to improve implementation. I think it would help the reader if your description of implementation concepts was move from the bottom line of page 1 to conclude the sentence of ‘Yet frameworks continue to focus on one concept alone or be innovation specific’, where these concepts are mentioned the first time. Please describe more in details the work of Greenhalgh et al. Please end the section with a more specific aim – for example the one given in the discussion: ‘The literature review sought to determine if frameworks varied depending on the innovation they were targeting’.

Results: could you please provide some examples of all of the different types of innovations: interventions, guidelines, knowledge, etc. –by for example adding a table. Please provide more details on the domains described by Mays and Aaron’s et al.

Discussion: Do you think the frameworks within the different types of innovation are too diverse to give concrete recommendations or could you provide examples of specific recommendation – take for example guidelines? That is for example if implementing a guideline what are the particular shortcomings in the implementation literature which you identified and what recommendations could
you give for how they should then specifically address an implementation process? When discussing the GIF you write that ‘The framework analysis may assist a user to choose an appropriate framework or combination of frameworks for their particular study or project. Could you explain more in depth how this will happen in practice?
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