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Reviewer's report:

Dear author,

First of all, I would like to congratulate you with the completion of your extensive study. I think you've invested huge efforts into preparing and conducting this study. In general I find your study relevant and interesting. However, in order for me to be able to evaluate your work more reliable I feel that the quality of reporting needs to be improved significantly.

Please see my comments below. I would really like to see this study published and would appreciate it greatly if the authors would be able to address my concerns.

Major Compulsory revisions

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   In Abstract: It is not clear to me, why do we need this research?
   In Background of Abstract: "The purpose of this study was to identify how the implementation of integrated mental health and primary care affected and was affected by coordination processes. Standardized coordination consists of impersonal codified processes. Personal coordination consists of interpersonal communication processes." The above sentences are not clear.
   In Results of Abstract: It is simple.
   This isn't clear from the manuscript that the relation of Personal and Standardized Coordination with the Integrated Care
   In Background: these should be more clearly stated and concise.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   In methods of Abstract: something should be described, such as the time of interviewed, et al.
   In Participants, something about 16 PC/MHI clinics across eight VA medical centers should be simple described.

3. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   I have an impression that the data could be more thoroughly/deeply discussed.
   What I miss is a discussion on the consequences of the findings for the existing
theories/practice. In the present version of the manuscript the previous findings are simply summed up without relating the new findings to the existing ones.

4. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes.

5. Are the data sound?
The data were sound.

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
I feel that the report of results should be more concise.

2. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes.

3. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Please see the comments on the abstract above.
The title conveys what has been done but not what has been found.

4. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.

Kind regards,
Jianqian Chao

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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