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Reviewer's report:

As mentioned in the first review the study findings are potentially interesting. However, I am not convinced that this version of the manuscript adds to the literature. I made some recommendations regarding the methodology (framework approach, choice of frameworks for analysis of the results) and the way the results are reported (best practices, lessons learned) in the first review process. On the whole, I am only moderately satisfied with the responses of the authors. No fundamental changes are made. E.g., the results remain difficult to read (bottlenecks, experienced, expected, barriers) and the lessons learned remain too general. One could probably learn more from an analysis of the results of 'the best /the worst' performing ACs and the way they organise collaboration. Currently the link between the study findings and the opportunities for quality improvement are too vague (next step in quality improvement). Furthermore, more reflection is needed about the use of the Chronic Care Model (CCM) as a framework for quality improvement of a service for people taking OAT. The main focus of the model is on integration of care for people with chronic conditions in the setting where they receive their regular care (mostly general practice). High quality collaboration with other services, as anticoagulant clinics (e.g. COPD patient or diabetes patient with OAT), are part of the way care is organised and delivered. Perhaps this point can be cleared out with one of the authors of the CCM or with other experts familiar with the CCM.
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