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Facilitated interprofessional implementation of a physical rehabilitation guideline for stroke in inpatient settings: process evaluation of a cluster randomized trial. Salbach NM et al. Implementation Science Empirical study

Abstract

The abstract is clearly written.

Background

The authors have addressed most points I previously raised, but would benefit from the inclusion of a summary of the main key findings from their previously published paper on the qualitative process evaluation, to add context, rather than simply stating on page 8, line 157 that this study has been 'recently published'.

In addition:

On page 6 the authors use 'interdisciplinary team' but it would be better to use 'multidisciplinary team' for consistency, which they do subsequently on page 7 in the background section.

Please could the authors define what they mean by 'passive strategies' on page 8, line 145.

On page 7, line 131 please explain how using a local facilitator 'can have a positive effect on changing clinical and organizational practices'?

Methods

The methods are now well written and the authors have addressed the points I previously raised.

Results
The results section has improved, but are still relatively brief. Rather than referring largely to the results listed in the tables, it would be better to discuss also in the text what are the main interesting results from tables II and III (page 16, lines 325-330).

In addition:

On page 15, line 319 could the authors describe also in the text the key characteristics of patient participants, rather than only referring the reader to Table 1 for this information.

On page 16, line 342 'the passive intervention' would seem to be better rephrased to 'the intervention utilising passive strategies (such as..)’ or something similar.

Discussion and conclusions

These sections are well written and my previous points have been addressed.

Can the authors please explain what they mean by 'passive dissemination' and give an example (page 20, line 416).

Tables and figure

Sufficient and relevant information is included in the tables and CONSORT diagram.
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