Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. The authors are quite correct when they say that this manuscript doesn’t really fit with the usual categories for submission; this is not presented as a debate. That notwithstanding, the content is aimed at non-specialists to enhance their understanding of Implementation Science and how it has a role to play, particularly in Learning Healthcare Organisations. The authors present a comprehensive overview of implementation approaches that can be used and contrast these with the associated strategies of traditional research and quality improvement. I liked this approach.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. I’m not sure about the title of the paper, particularly the ‘why should I care’ – in my opinion it needs to refer to what is included in the summary section, namely as an engine of change.
2. For this paper to be a debate submission, it would be helpful to provide more of an argument for the use of implementation science within healthcare organisations, including why some of the stated approaches are used. The use of examples from published works is helpful but they require the reader to read each one to understand the rationale given for that particular choice of method or design. It would be useful to have more of the rationales included in this paper, thereby providing the argument aspects of a debate article.
3. The authors refer to Learning Healthcare organisations in the abstract and yet this doesn’t get a mention until the very end of the manuscript. International readers will not know about these and so these need to be explained in the background section to provide context and focus for the rest of the paper.
4. In the abstract, the use of mixed methods is mentioned however later in the paper the authors correctly explain that methods do not have to be quantitative-qualitative in nature so this needs to either clarified or corrected in the abstract.
5. The format of the paper with all the subheadings doesn’t appear to align with the journal style. They are also quite distracting, rather than helpful. They break the flow of the paper. Furthermore after reading other papers published in this journal, the referencing style of the manuscript does not conform to the journal style and so this needs to be changed.

Discretionary revisions
6. The focus of the journal is Psychology and I was left wondering why there was no attempt made to draw on this focus in the manuscript. It is implied in the content of the case examples but this could be made more explicit in the background section starting line 193, in the section unpacking the basics of IS.
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