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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

I was impressed with the number of concerns raised on the first review and the authors were given an opportunity to respond.

It is still a concern about whether this is a research report or a descriptive report on administering a CCT program.

In the end, it is not clear that something novel was created.

There are a lot of editorial changes still needed in this amended version. Initial pilot study information and results need to be in the past tense. There are many long, long sentences. Many of these should be two sentences. There are plural verbs that should not be plural.

Specific Comments

The purpose of this study was to create an implementation tool kit (AIDED) to bridge the gap between the needs of the patients with multiple chronic conditions and available community programs. The aim of the study was to develop an implementation toolkit to sustain referrals to the CCT in the future. The gap should be restated in this purpose statement

In the pilot study, patients reported improvement on the Patient Assessment of Chronic Illness Care (PACIC) but there were no significant differences in pain, or anxiety/depression compared to the control group.

In the full study initiated, they did not include any outcome measures regarding whether it was successful. The goal was to develop a toolkit but use an existing model of CTT: Assess, Innovate, Develop, Engage and Devolve (AIDED) Model for Dissemination, Diffusion and Scale UP.

The methodology was relatively brief. Did it include the same type of action plan as described in the pilot study?
Results:

The researchers used an existing model of a CCT to create a tool kit of seven components. The seven components were not clear. Looked like 5 were: (Assess, Innovate, Develop, Engage, Devolve). This was the same as the model for the CCT. What were the other two components?

There seemed to be little concern about problems of physical independence of patients with multiple chronic disabilities in this model. The patient example was focused on finances primarily. Were there any examples where physical needs were met or independence was achieved?

I am not sure what was new in this "study". I suppose it was new to create a brochure for the Community Care Team at the Mayo Clinic with instructions about eligibility and contact information to work with a social worker. This should be clarified.

Conclusion. The conclusion was that a toolkit for a Community Care Team was created and implemented in a well resourced healthcare system to improve referrals to the program and give feedback to primary care providers. The health care system should have been described in the methodology.

As part of the conclusion, the authors recommended that future research should test to see if the CCT program improves patient health. This recommendation should be in the discussion. The authors should indicate why they did not measure patient outcomes.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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