Reviewer's report

Title: Multidisciplinary teams of case managers in the implementation of innovative integrated services delivery for elderly people in France

Version: 2 Date: 27 January 2014

Reviewer: Victoria Stanhope

Reviewer's report:

This article presents a qualitative study on the utilization of multidisciplinary teams of case managers to implement services for elderly people in France. Overall, article is well written and provides an excellent discussion about how multidisciplinary teams function and how these processes enhance program implementation. The main weakness is in the presentation of the results which do not clearly answer the study questions.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The literature would be improved by adding the Assertive Community Treatment literature which has extensively explored the nature and advantages of teams in implementing services including the collaboration between case managers – see Stefan Priebe, Gary Bond, Susan Phillips, Victoria Stanhope, Michelle Saylers.

2. At times the delineation of professional roles is unclear. Did the participants have roles of case managers which were somehow separate from their profession, i.e. were they case managers who happened to be nurses or did they play the role of nurse on the team? Clarification of this would help to inform the discussion section of what constitutes interdisciplinary work.

3. Need to clarify the criteria for the focus groups – was there only one team at each site? Were there 14 focus groups? What was the range of people attending the focus groups?

4. The description of the coding and analysis could be more specific to the data. Give examples of your open, axial and selective coding.

5. The description of the sample would be better placed in the methods section – within the study population paragraph.

6. I would suggest beginning the results section with a paragraph introducing the themes, which would tie them together – so the reader is clearer how they are answering the research questions and how they hold together.

7. “Appropriation of the integration…” is not a good theme title – it is too literal – further abstraction is needed in the analysis to capture the essence of this theme. Overall the way the themes are presented it is not always clear – how much these are just straightforward implementation issues or critiques of the
intervention as opposed to how they relate to multidisciplinary teams, which is the focus of the data analysis. Again “Support for Clinical Interventions…” does not seem to be addressing the focus of the study directly. There needs to be a refinement of the analysis which can generate more focused themes and make the connections between them more evident.

8. On the whole the discussion section is excellent but because of the weakness in the way that the results are presented – it does not always seem to be building on the results. If the results are improved, they will better support the discussion section.
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