Reviewer's report

Title: Do existing mechanisms contribute to improvements in care coordination across levels of care in health services networks? Opinions of health personnel in Colombia and Brazil

Version: 2 Date: 20 February 2015

Reviewer: Ilana Graetz

Reviewer's report:

The authors interviewed several key informants working in healthcare in Columbia and Brazil to learn their perspectives on use and effectiveness of care coordination mechanisms. While this is an important and timely topic that will likely be of interest to journal readers, the authors need to provide essential information about the methods and motivation for the study.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. It is not clear why the two countries, Columbia and Brazil, were selected for this study. They have different healthcare systems and organizational structures. Were there reasons why these two countries made for an interesting analyses and comparison?

2. Were there specific factors or characteristics of the two healthcare systems that drove hypothesis about what the authors expected to find in terms of use care coordination. For example, did they believe that a single payer system like Brazil would have higher use of care coordination mechanisms relative to Columbia?

3. In the methods, the authors state that the specific regions included were selected for being densely populated with a large proportion of low SES patients. Why was this important/relevant for this study?

4. How were the networks contacted to participate in the study? Who was contacted in each network? What proportion refused?

5. Once the network agreed to participate, how were individual informants selected? Was it a random sample? Did any refuse? What proportion refused?

6. Who conducted the interviews? Was it the same in both countries?

7. Describe the difference between an administrative professional and a manager.

- Minor Essential Revisions

8. The writing throughout could be more concise with shorter sentences and clearer language. For example, the definition of care coordination on page 4 is confusing. Unclear what the authors mean by 'objective administering the conflicts'.
9. In table 2, define ‘I level’, ‘II level’, and ‘III level’

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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