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Response to reviewers

We thank both referee 1 and the editorial advisor for re-reviewing our manuscript.

Referee 1

Referee 1 noticed that no sample size (power) calculations are provided for the study. The study is powered on the primary study outcome ‘health related quality of life’. This manuscript focuses on continuity of care and medication adherence as outcome measures, for which we performed no power calculations. We better describe this in the Methods.

Editorial advisor

1. As the editorial advisor suggests, we added to the final paragraph of the Results section that the mid-levels of team continuity were associated with the lowest medication adherence (p=0.04).

2. We agree with the editorial advisor that we should acknowledge in the Discussion that patients who did not contact any care provider at all in the last year had high level of medication adherence. We now added this to the Discussion.

3. The first limitation that we mention is the fact that 53% of patients reported not seeing anyone for their heart failure, while they almost all filled in the continuity questions and, based on their medical record, almost all contacted a care provider in the last year. Therefore, we do not agree with the editorial advisor that this limitation is not mentioned in the manuscript.
4. We included in both Results and Discussion that team continuity was related to medication adherence in a non-linear way. In the Discussion, as the editorial advisor suggests, we state that the importance of this non-linear relationship is unknown. It should be interpreted with caution. More research is needed before firm conclusions can be drawn about this relationship.