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Reviewer's report:

This study describe the planning and implementation of a quality improvement initiative to improve care for people living with opioid use disorder. While it is an important and timely topic, comments to strengthen the study are noted below.

Abstract:
1. Given the stated goal of describing implementation of the QI project, it seems that the results should focus on implementation, not primarily on the demographics of patients.
2. The conclusions should be based on the results; however, the conclusion discusses qualitative data that are not reported in the results section. It is unclear what qualitative data are being referenced.

Background:
1. Can the authors provide a description of the most responsible provider (MRP)? Is this similar to a primary care physician in the US?
2. There is some repeated information in the Setting and Context sections. This reviewer suggests combining these sections.

Measurement and Evaluation:
1. Can the authors define what is meant by treatment stage or provide an example (Line 184)?
2. How was it identified if the encounter was for OUD (line 195)? Was this based on EHR data from the problem list, ICD-10 codes?
3. Please reference the PROMIS Global 10 (line 197).

Results:
1. The results could be significantly strengthened by providing examples/more details. For example, could the authors provide examples of the evidence-based changes that the team to could select (lines 224-225 under Participating Teams)? Under Fidelity to BTS components, could more details be provided about the waiver of team selection based on the overall Collaborative aims and how this was determined (who made this decision?).

Discussion:
1. The discussion should provide examples of what were deemed to be facilitators and barriers of implementation to inform future QI projects. For example:
   a. why do the authors feel that 41% of the teams did not show improved progress throughout the
Collaborative? What do they think could have been done differently to increase the odds of progress?
b. It is stated that this QI project was successful. Is there other existing literature on other similar QI project to which to compare the results? How is success defined?
c. It is mentioned that QI resources were highly variable among teams. Can the authors provide examples of these resources and how this might be improved in future projects?

As currently written, the paper provides information specific to their project but does provide suggestions on how this systems-level approach could be improved upon through lessons learned. Restructuring the discussion could significantly increase the impact of this paper's contribution to the current literature on this important topic.
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