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Reviewer's report:

This manuscript addresses an critical issue for the field of dissemination and implementation research—how we best train the workforce.

The manuscript has several strengths:

• It is very well written and clearly articulates its aims and approach.
• It focuses on a local application of already established national programs for D&I training.
• It provides links to key content, thereby enabling readers to access and benefit from resources developed or adapted for the CRISP program.

Compulsory revisions:

The manuscript would be strengthened by the following edits and modifications.

Several related suggested revisions stem from the paper’s statement that its aim is to “bring home” to local context aspects of previously reported national training programs in dissemination and implementation science. Related to this aim, I suggest that the paper’s contribution would be greater if:

First, the authors should elaborate on the specific aspects of the local context at CRISP that led to the decision to develop a local training program, and that guided its development. Tell us more about the local group of D&I researchers: their professional backgrounds, thrust of their research (prevention? Basic or clinical? Intervention development? )

Second, tell us more about the content, frameworks, or resources that were selected from existing national training programs. What was borrowed, what was adapted, and what was modified—and from which existing programs--for the local CRISP training?

Second, since the purpose was to engage both new and intermediate learners, it will be helpful to add some detail about the different needs of these two groups of learners. What were the challenges of combining learners of both levels in the same training event? What were the advantages? What conclusions were drawn about this inclusion of learners at different levels?

Third, please add some detail about one of the educational products identified—the new graduate course. How does the course differ from this
introductory albeit very intense workshop?

Fourth, the paper identified several initiatives that have followed or are an outgrowth of this workshop….the workbook, the monthly seminar, the new graduate course…

It might be helpful to develop a table showing the focus, target audience, and key components of each.

Finally, it would be helpful for have more detail about the evaluation results. The response rate (23%) is relatively low. Why and how does that affect confidence in the results?

Why/How did evaluation ratings differ by participants’:

# Participating level (beginner, more advanced)
# Discipline or field

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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