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Author’s response to reviews:

Editor comments

Page 8 – ‘Because of variations in terminology used to describe similar activities and the multifactorial nature of some initiatives, a degree of judgement was required when determining which group, the initiative should be assigned to. Differences of opinion were resolved by discussion among the authors.” – please provide more detail (i.e., did one author categorise all initiatives which was checked by another author(s)? Or did two authors classify independently and then resolved any differences through discussion?

This is clarified on Page 8/ Line 164 and 168

- Page 15 – ‘The components of care varied, with 12 studies concentrating on one disease type [(cancer: one (60-66)] – should this be seven studies which have looked at integrated care models in cancer (instead of one as written here)?
Seven is correct and has been amended (Page 15/Line 329)

- Page 21 – ‘The robustness of evidence examined in this review was, however, limited.’ – please acknowledge in the limitations section that you have not appraised the quality of the studies for methodological quality and therefore your conclusions should be accepted with this caveat.

This is clarified on Page 22/Line 489-490 and at Page 23/ Line 501