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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Paul Wilson

Thank you for your comments and the opportunity to amend our manuscript for publication in Implementation Science. In response to the first request, we have changed the term “effectiveness” to “success” throughout the study and have modified our inclusion criteria:

“All study designs were included if they reported to evaluate a research implementation strategy for promoting evidence-informed policy and management decisions in healthcare.”

We believe this issue is a difference in how “effectiveness studies” are conceptualised. In our review we have synthesised the results of studies that report to evaluate the success (effectiveness) of research implementation strategies using any available research design. For example, the Chambers 2012 study includes a section ‘Evaluation and Outcome’ that reports usefulness ratings (0-10 scale) and qualitative results from commissioners. Where the Wilson 2015 study aimed to explore participant views about whether, how and why HSE has been helpful in their work, what features are most and least helpful and why, and recommendations for how to improve it.
In order to address the second request, risk of bias for experimental studies (RCT and quasi-experimental) has now been assessed using the Cochrane Collaborations tool for assessing risk of bias. Risk of bias for non-experimental studies (cohort, cross-sectional, and qualitative) has now been assessed using: (1) Quality Assessment Tool for Observational Cohort and Cross-Sectional Studies from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute; and (2) Critical Appraisal Skills Program (CASP) Qualitative Checklist for qualitative, case study, and evaluation designs.

We have also commented on the 11 titles excluded due to no data reporting (e.g. protocol, abstract, etc.) in the discussion section.

We hope our response and manuscript changes adequately address any concerns. If changes have not been to the editors satisfaction, we are prepared to make further changes as necessary.

Kind regards

Mitchell Sarkies