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Reviewer's report:

This is a well-written manuscript on an important topic in primary care delivery and organization. The paper has a well-organized background section that clearly summarizes the important information already known about team-based care in primary care and identifies how the paper will contribute to this literature. The methods section is clearly organized and describes appropriate methods for the study. I think the paper could be improved by addressing the following issues:

1) subheadings and grouping of data by conceptual themes within the barriers and facilitators identified by the authors would make this section easier for readers to follow.

2) table 4 could include a row for each of the six practices without compromising practice identities. That would be more informative than the current roll-up of clearly disparate clinics and widely diverse locations.

3) quotes from the interviews could be edited without damaging the meaning or eliminating the individual voices.

4) the conclusion section would be improved by addressing some of the current efforts to change payment methods and how these could support (or not) team-based approaches.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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