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Thank you very much for asking me to review this interesting paper about practice in North Carolina primary care practices.

Minor comments

There are some abbreviations used in this paper that are not spelt out the first time they are presented.

There are some contexts that are quite US specific that need to be spelt out a bit more of a non-US audience. For example, "based on insurance reimbursement practices (e.g. providers who met the eligibility requirements) - this didn't really make sense to me as I did not understand the context.

Another example was line 257 and PharmDs and might be to explain some of the Medicaid payment systems so that an international audience can better understand the US context.

Line 92 - "recommended care related to chronic conditions" probably should be "for people with chronic conditions"

I think the sampling strategy would be better described as purposive rather than purposeful.

Be consistent with what the primary care practices are called. Sometimes they are primary care practices and other times they are clinics.

There needs to be more clarity about the people recruited. In line 139 you describe providers, managers and staff. I interpreted this as providers were the health professionals. In line 144 you
describe splitting them into providers, managers from clinical and non-clinical - this confused me because of the assumptions I had made about providers.

It is confusing to describe the focus groups as interviews. Did you undertake group semi-structured interviews or focus group discussions? I think what you have done is focus group discussions. Don't use the terms interchangeably as they are different methods.

Table 3 - it would be better to present mean (SD) age and time in profession and practice as it gives the reader a sense of the range.

Table 4 - I think this data would be more useful to be presented slightly differently. You present min and max for the characteristics of areas and practices and it is interesting but it would be more interesting and useful to know what proportion of the practices were and the low or high median income etc. The results might be interpreted very differently if >half of the practices are high or low income etc.

Quotes - should have some sort of identifier such as "practice 1" and perhaps "clinician or manager etc". This just enables the reader to determine that the evidence presented is from a range of practices and participants.

Figure 2 - not sure this really adds to the paper and could be left out.

Major revisions

The authors discuss a framework content analysis and present the framework in figure 1 and some data in table 2. However, the results section is presented according to the topic questions from the focus groups. It is not clear why table 2 is presented as there is only a brief reference to it. I think the results section would be much improved if it was structured according to the coding framework. Table 2 would then have some sort of purpose in the results section. Headings from the framework coding categories should be used throughout the results section to guide the reader.

Discussion

The discussion need to be revised. At the moment, it really repeats part of the results section. The authors do not relate their findings back to the literature to explain how their research has
extended what we know about primary care teams. Be care about making statements such as "significantly influenced…" as your data do not allow you to say this. The conclusion included comments about policy context and policy levers etc but this needs to be addressed more in the discussion.
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