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Reviewer's report:

This is a very well written, detailed protocol that addresses critical aspects of discharge communication to providers and patients. The completed study will make important recommendations for practice improvement.

I only have a couple of recommendations for improvement. And researchers in countries other than UK. But the alternative word, discharge summary, also not used in the same way in every country. I don't really have a suggestion. It becomes clear as one reads the paper that this is a written summary provided to providers and sometimes patients. It would be helpful to clarify the content of the letters in the final report of the study. Is the letter a reminder for follow-up, a summary of the hospitalization, or patient instructions for self-care at home. With the expansion of electronic communication, it is not clear how these letters are transmitted and if they remain in the form of a 'letter' when transmitted electronically.

I do not see in the GP interview guide questions t

The use of the term 'discharge letter' may be confusing to providers that would address research question 3.

Lines 76 and 83 - The term service-user is introduced but not explained.

Line 97. you refer to programme theory. Those familiar with realist review will know what this is but the general audience will need this defined or described.

Line 150 purpose should be purposive

Line 152 - add patients after 10,000

Line 173 - address the potential bias in having GPS select letter - will they screen out poor letters
line 176 - patients who lack capacity... capacity for what? Later in the paper it suggests lack of capacity to consent - the term decisionally incapacitated could be used.

Line 187 and 190 - you use the term 'more or less' successful examples of discharge letters - then you state that they are coded as successful or unsuccessful. The term 'more or less has different connotations than the binary coding.

Line 192 - what kinds of comments on reasons for selection are you referring to - was a list of reasons developed a priori

Line 344 - the abbreviation PPI is used so seldom in the paper that it should be written out
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