Reviewer’s report

Title: Training Scholars in Dissemination and Implementation Research for Cancer Prevention and Control: A Mentored Approach

Version: 0 Date: 15 Nov 2017

Reviewer: Zahra Aziz

Reviewer’s report:

Congratulations on writing an important article on the mentored-training in Dissemination and Implementation Research. It is a useful article and provides important insights for training and capacity building of researchers.

Here are some of my observations and comments.

Abstract:

[Line 53: "and training and...."] Is this an ongoing training? How is this different from the 5-day intensive training?

Background:

The background section lacks an in-depth analysis of the current situation in D&I training and skips the basic information such as, what is D&I, why it is important to train the workforce in this area, what has been done so far etc. While a lot of readers of this journal would be aware of the field and issues, but others such as early career researchers who are changing fields or students would benefit from an adequate background and rationale to the issue. For example, Line 102 in the Background section indicates the research to practice translation gap of 17 years, without explaining what that means. Many readers might not be able to connect the dots automatically between the importance of D&I, research to practice gap, and the need for training. Hence, consider rewriting background section in a bit more informed and structured way.

Line 86-88: It is unclear whether they have explored the availability of international (other than US and CA) training and courses etc. If the focus is on the US and Canada only, then it should come across in the background section as well as limitations.

Methods:

Consider adding a pictorial representation of the training, mentoring and evaluation for the purpose of clarity of this section. There is a lot of information flowing through the methods section which I was struggling to connect. A clear diagram highlighting all important components would add a lot of value to this paper.
Line 145-146 'most successful recruitment strategy': This is an important finding and should be moved to the 'results' section.

Line 192 - Mentoring: This is a very interesting description, however, would be more reader-friendly if supported by a pictorial form/diagram/figure or a table.

Line 206: "The self-paced course..." This is listed as one of the mentoring components, however, is not presented consistently with the other components. Consider moving it to a new line. A diagram highlighting these several important components would help readers going through this text smoothly.

Line 225 - Methods section, talks about 'facilitators and barriers' to mentor-mentee relationships. It would be interesting to share some of those factors in results.

Results:

Although future directions point towards investigating fellow's academic outputs, it would be interesting to include some of the preliminary data here. Considering that the domain that saw the least increase in skill was "design and analysis", and participants had low satisfaction for "opportunity" as compared to the value that was put on this domain, it would be really useful to see some practical results (outcomes/opportunities) as a result of direct mentoring.

Is there any data on how many of recommended monthly calls between mentors-mentees actually occurred? What was the average duration of those call? What are some of the enablers or barriers to using monthly telephone meetings in a mentored-approach? Similarly, how many mentees attended regular webinars etc.?

Some other general feedback:

Several terms are used interchangeably that may create confusion among readers. Such as (scholars, early career fellows, researchers, D&I investigators), (implementation research, implementation science), and (D&I science, D&I research).

Abbreviations have either described but not necessarily used such as (Line 48-49 Abstract) or have been used without defining the full form (Line 49 Abstract).
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