

Reviewer's report

Title: A systematic review of the care coordination measurement landscape

Version: 1 **Date:** 17 December 2012

Reviewer: Jeannie Haggerty

Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

yes

3. Are the data sound?

yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

yes

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?

yes

This is a well-written report of an ambitious and systematic review of coordination measures. The supplementary information in particular is very helpful and informative. In combination with the Care Coordination Measures Atlas, this will be a very valuable resource.

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

In the discussion, p 16 & 17 there are two paragraphs dealing with measurement gaps relevant to the Medicare studies. These could be more clearly written to

more clearly give the message that the identified measurement gaps require development not just because they are identified gaps on the mapping but because they represent relatively common healthcare scenarios. At this point the last paragraph on p.16 and first on p.17 sometimes read as non sequiter at first reading.

Though its publication falls outside the April 2012 update, a recent measure may be of interest to add: Haggerty JL, Roberge D, Freeman GK, Beaulieu C, Breton M: Validation of a generic measure of continuity of care: when patients encounter several clinicians. *Ann Fam Med* 2012, 10(5):443-451.

Table 3 does not add information beyond what is stated in the text and could easily be removed. By contrast the information currently in supplemental file #1, Measurement Framework Definitions, is highly relevant and constitutes a significant contribution to knowledge.

Minor Essential Revisions

None.

Major Compulsory Revisions

None