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Reviewer's report:

General

The revised manuscript is very clear and fully addresses the comments contained in my initial review report and the first reviewer's report.

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

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

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

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The authors should consider exclusive use of "collaborative support teams" rather than mixed use of that label and "decision support teams." The latter implies a team of technical staff providing advice and "support for" (or "input into") clinical decision-making, rather than a team of fellow clinicians who provide support and shared care. Although advice and input are an important role for support team members, the term "decision support team" suggests that this is their exclusive role. The authors' use of "collaborative support teams" elsewhere in the manuscript seems preferable to me.

The Conclusion paragraph in the abstract does not reflect the text in the main body. Adding the authors' point regarding the need for further research would strengthen the abstract.

The main empirical findings are presented in narrative format. The authors should consider whether they wish to place the key results in a table, following conventional practice for longer papers. This is optional and the manuscript will remain clear and useful whether or not a table format is employed.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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