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Reviewer's report:

This paper suffers from the weaknesses of the barriers facilitators models of organisational improvement since it assumes that reinforcing the facilitators and addressing or removing the barriers will produce an improvement in service or in "integration" however those things are defined. Health services must address multiple objectives together and I think this paper could benefit from considering the language of the Quadruple Aim of patient care, population health improvement, increased efficiency and staff wellbeing. Alternatively, a model of access would be useful such as those by Anderson -Andersen, Ronald (1995). "Revisiting the behavioral model and access to medical care: does it matter?". J Health Soc Behav. 36 (1): 1-10. doi:10.2307/2137284. PMID 7738325. or Levesque -Levesque JF, Harris MF, Russell G. Patient-centred access to health care: conceptualising access at the interface of health systems and populations. Int J Equity Health 2013;12:18. The IHI Quality Improvement Cycle also provides a model of improvement that might be of help.

Barriers and facilitators are likely to work differently in particular settings and so the analysis of those instances where staff reported different perceptions is important. For instance, did the views of prescribers and no-prescribers differ? Were there any particular differences between the volunteers and the paid staff?

In the structuring of the paper, I am particularly interested in what this paper tells us that is not already known. This is the key role of the discussion which could be shortened by ensuring that it does not repeat the results in the earlier section. The focus should be on the new knowledge that has been generated and how that may or may not be be relevant in other contexts. It might be useful to consider one of the models of integration such as that by Pim Valentijne - Valentijn, PP, Schepman, SM, Opheij, W and Bruijnzeels, MA (2013). Understanding integrated care: a comprehensive conceptual framework based on the integrative functions of primary care. International Journal of Integrated Care [serial online] Mar 201322: 13.Available from: URN:NBN:NL:UI:10-1-114415.

In conclusion, the paper addresses an important issue but needs to do so more incisively if it is to make a worthwhile contribution to the literature. I would like to see this paper published but it needs to go beyond the limitations of barriers and facilitators in my view.
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