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Reviewer's report:

As advocated, I strongly agree there is a need to further consider applicability and transferability in systematic reviews, to improve their usefulness in policy and practice. The purpose is therefore relevant.

However, more than a tool we need a process that integrates applicability and transferability within the review methodology itself (e.g. by involving policymakers or practitioners in the review process).

The theme is relevant, but methods are not clearly and precisely presented. This is the major limitation of this paper. The reliability of the results cannot be evaluated without knowing how they were produced.

More precisely:

Methods related to the thematic review (about the effects integrated care) and the methodological review (about existing literature relating to applicability and transferability) are mixed; that is confusing.

Methods of the methodological review have to be detailed according classical reporting guidelines (e.g. papers inclusion criteria, used keywords).

The empirical study and feedback from the stakeholders: they should also be detailed using, if possible, reporting guidelines (e.g. population description, analysis methods… ).
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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