Reviewer’s report

Title: Mapping guide for adapting a multisite educational intervention: Mobilization of Vulnerable Elders in Ontario (MOVE ON)

Version: 1 Date: 3 September 2014

Reviewer: Annie McCluskey

Reviewer’s report:

General comments:
It was a pleasure to review this interesting, well-written and well-designed study. The conceptual and theoretical frameworks used to inform the study represent best-practice in implementation science, and are a strength of this paper.

As the authors note, a key contribution to knowledge is their analysis and ranking of key barriers by multiple sites in Ontario, and how they have used that barrier analysis to develop an implementation guide for MOVE ON users. Clinicians and managers will be able to understand the menu and schema provided. The authors also provide examples of how to tackle the root causes of barriers, such as lack of awareness and staff indifference to mobilisation using ‘mobility champions’ and coaches, and leadership initiatives.

1. Was the question posed by the authors (and were the aims) well defined?
   • No questions were reported/stated, which is appropriate for this design.
   • Aims of the study: Study aim is not clearly stated in the abstract or main body of the paper.
   • Currently the abstract states ‘to spread the MOVE ON intervention, we developed a systematic approach to map intervention adaptations to setting specific barriers’ (page 2).
   • In the main body the authors note: ‘The development of this reference guide is described here (page 7)…and ‘to develop the guide we used the COM-B system..’
   • Therefore perhaps the aim was to ‘develop, describe and test’ the reference guide?
   • Also as I read the results it became apparent that classification of barriers are a key part of this study - the discussion also starts with a commentary of the significant barriers for the units, staff and patients—perhaps that is one of the key aims (classifying the key barriers)?

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISION: Document study aim(s) in the abstract and main body of the paper (page 7).

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The phases of the study are clearly delineated (Phase 1 = Implementation
coaches create a provisional menu of intervention activities; Phase 2 = focus groups for barrier analysis and to assess knowledge, capability and readiness to implement MOVE ON; Phase 3 = Recording adaptations to MOVE ON; Phase 4 = mapping barriers and intervention activities using COM-B system; Phase 5 = Development of the MOVE ON+ guide).

At each phase the authors have described who/how many researchers or clinicians were involved. Several examples are provided. The protocol paper (Liu et al. 2013) is referenced as another source related to the study methods, and I read that alongside the current manuscript as I expect other readers will.

No amendments.

3. Are the data sound (Results, pages 10-13)?

All results and content provided in the tables are well presented and described.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes. No amendments required.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data (pages 14-18)?

Key messages and findings from the study could be highlighted in the first paragraph of the discussion (discretionary revision).

The discussion highlights the tailoring of interventions to key barriers, how the barriers were ranked, and how to get at the ‘root cause’ of barriers. More could be explained about the process of identifying the root cause(s) with teams. Did teams rank the barriers then have further discussion, or did the research team do the final ranking?

I liked the example given of strategies to address indifference and lack of motivation (eg mobility champions and mentors).

Although the discussion is relatively short, I don’t see any need to expand it any more. The paper makes a major contribution to knowledge as it stands.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS:
Include a summary of key messages /findings in the first paragraph of discussion.
Discuss more about the process of ranking barriers, and identifying the root causes (perhaps that is 'methods' rather than discussion?).

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Limitations section is adequate

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished (in background and elsewhere)?

Yes, the background is well described and referenced.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
Page 1 - Title refers to ‘mapping guide’ and ‘multisite educational intervention’ and includes the population of ‘vulnerable elders’; however, the title does not clearly highlight the hospital setting/ inpatients as the target group. I suggest that one of these terms be included in the title.

Page 2 – Abstract: The abstract methods clearly describe collecting focus group data, mapping perceived barriers against the COM-B taxonomy, and mapping barriers to root causes, then mapping or linking together the behavioural constructs and planned intervention activities. Results indicate that 46 focus groups were conducted with 261 health professionals at 26 inpatient units in Ontario. This quantity of qualitative data about barriers is impressive, and clearly described for readers. In results examples are provided in the 3 categories of barrier (health professional, patient and unit) and 30 intervention activities are reported, again with some examples. The methods and resulting guide described will be attractive to readers and researchers, and provide an excellent example for other broad scale KT projects. The only thing missing is the study aim(s).

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISION: Abstract requires a study aim, as noted previously

DISCRETIONARY REVISION – consider adding a word or two into the title to reflect inpatient/hospital population as the target patient group

9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes. Writing is excellent. Referencing style is very well edited.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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