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Dear Dr. Rankin,

Thanks for the opportunity to resubmit the manuscript ISCM-D-19-00002 “Implementation Science Made Too Simple: A Teaching Tool.” I very much appreciated the close read and comments from the reviewer and yourself. I address the comments individually in this letter as well as in the assigned box in the online form. I list the reviewer’s comments here in italics.

Response to Reviewers:

1. Could the distinction between the types of research/strategies and outcomes be clearer? Is there potential value in reframing the content as questions? E.g., Intervention/practice/innovation: What is the THE THING? Effectiveness research: Does the thing WORK?

Thanks for this comment, and I have made two iterations of a revised slide for consideration. The “version 2” of the slide applies the reframe suggestion of using questions for effectiveness and implementation research and re-orders the placement of the definitions of the strategies and research. “Version 1” of the figure keeps the slide essentially unchanged, except I added an element to the outcomes sentence to make it broader and clearer (see below, as I also changed the text). My current thought is to go with “Version 1” revision. While I like the question reframe, I felt I needed to reduce the scope of the definition of implementation research to match the construction of the effectiveness research question, and I didn’t think that served the spirit of the slide. More specifically, in version 1, the definition of implementation research is “looks at how best to help people/places DO THE THING” and in version 2 it is “do the strategies actually help people/places DO THE THING?” (to match the effectiveness definition question of “Does THE THING work?”) Hence, I am leaning towards using revised version 1. Additionally, I would say here that given the iterations it has already gone through and the very good reaction I have gotten with it over these last 2 years on its helpfulness and clarity, I hesitate to change it too much... specially the definition used for implementation research in the broader sense, which includes observational research and does not limit it to interventional research. This being said, I
realize that I might be “too close” to the issue, so I am submitting both for your reaction. I am happy to discuss and revise further based upon your thoughts and recommendation.

2. Typographical errors:

   a. Line 10: “Implementation should read “implementation”
   b. Line 23: “implementations” should read “implementation”
   c. Line 41: “Damschorder” should read “Damschroder”
   d. Line 98: “on other scholars” should read “and other scholars”

Thanks for finding these and they have all been corrected. I also changed the following sentence in line 77 (underlined text indicates the change): “I refer to those outcomes as measures of how much and how well they (implementers) “do the thing.” I then added the following sentence for further clarification (lines 78-79): Verbally, I explain that these measures are focused on the extent (how much) and the quality (how well) of implementation.

Again, many thanks for the opportunity to resubmit the manuscript.

My best, Geoff Curran