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Reviewer's report:

General
Tailoring the implementation of interventions to site and provider specific needs is an important topic in implementation science. This article reports survey responses from 21 primary care providers who are participants in a collaborative care intervention for pain management. The major limitation of the manuscript (as appropriately noted by the author) is that this manuscript reports the results of a survey to a small number (21) providers.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

In general, I found the description of SEACAP too detailed. Though this survey was conducted as part of this study, the report itself is limited to clinician survey responses and therefore the references to the larger study should be limited. For example, the target enrollment and study period for SEACAP does not contribute to the topic of the report and the makeup of the SEACAP team appears to be unnecessary to this report.

The overall number of patients followed by the participating sites was not informative. Rather, it would be helpful if there was a fuller description of the sites at which the providers are located. For example, are these sites located in a specific area of the country or over several different regions? How large are the clinics? Though the author does note that clinicians are from 3 urban and 2 rural sites, how many were from each setting?

I did not understand why information from non-intervention providers was reported since they did not complete the preference survey. This information should be deleted as well as the comparison between intervention and control clinicians since it is does not contribute to the primary or secondary objective of the study.

Though a clinician's reporting that they wanted to cosign all intervention notes were positively associated with preference for telephone or pager communication and with being contacted before intervention team assessments, I couldn’t find where the number of providers who reported these classifications was noted in the manuscript. Please include.

Though the authors report that the level of priority placed by clinicians on skilled chronic pain management was positively correlated with preference for in-person communication, I could not find descriptive information concerning how the 21 clinicians responded to the questions presented in Appendix A. This would have been helpful in understanding the correlations described on pages 5 and 6. Please include.

Discretionary Revisions
Since the clinicians were from rural and urban sites, it would have been interesting to this reader if there were (or were not) differences in the reported preferences between the two settings.

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

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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