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Reviewer's report:

General: This paper is very difficult to read and understand. The literature review in the beginning is describing a number of structural (or infrastructural) aspects of coordination derived from the literature, and lumping together a number of very different references. The concepts are not very well defined and it is difficult to know why certain aspects of coordination have been chosen, for example marketing infrastructure. The whole paper has a structural bias, ignoring the processes of organizing, and also a focus on coordination mechanisms, ignoring other important aspects of integration, for example collaboration, cooperation, teamwork etc. There are a lot of empirical data presented, but the results are difficult to assess because of the conceptual weaknesses of the paper.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached): The concepts derived from the literature review have to be better defined and there should be an explanation why they have been chosen at the expense of other possible concepts. There is also a need to describe shortly the health care system of Taiwan, which may be a reason for choosing certain concepts like marketing infrastructure. For a European reader it is very difficult for example to understand why marketing should be an important area for coordination.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct): The description of the PCCN project on page 5 can be shortened, since most of the information is in Figure 1. The additional information on clinical specialties could be summarised in a table.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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