Reviewer’s report

Title: The case study approach

Version: 3 Date: 3 March 2011

Reviewer: Joseph Watine

Reviewer’s report:

In my previous review of Sarah Crowe et al’s manuscript, my impression was that their paper was less practical than theoretical. In this new version the authors are providing more details about practical examples of case studies that they performed. This is a good point. However there is still very much room for improvement.

In the example provided in box 1 to 4, the sections “some of the main findings” or “key findings” (why two different formulations by the way?) need to be clarified. For example:
- In box 1: this section does not contain any finding at all.
- In box 2: in which ways were policies contradictory?
- In box 3: in which ways was the timeline unrealistic?
- In box 4: NHS initiatives and policies are not explained in the previous sections. What were exactly these initiatives and policies?

In conclusion, this paper still needs to be improved so that a lay person (and I am almost a lay person) can at least understand what it is about and how the authors’ works helped to improve any outcome, or at least, as they put it in their conclusion, “yielded powerful insights into important aspects of health and healthcare delivery”.
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