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Creating a Sustainable Community Care Team (CCT): Developing an Implementation Toolkit to Support Healthcare-Community Partnerships in the Care of Patients with Multiple Chronic Conditions

The paper is a revision of a paper submitted to BMC Family Medicine and being transferred to BMC Health Services Research. Feedback from one reviewer and the authors reply is attached.

The aim of the paper: "the aim of this study was to develop an implementation toolkit to sustain referral to the CCT in the future"

Overall comment:

The overall topic of the paper is important; many pilot studies and RCTs are performed; but few leads to sustainable implementation and regular use as soon as projects are finished. The pilot study was published in 2013/2014/2017 (refs 12, 13,15). It is unclear if implementation challenges are established as result in ref 17, a paper under review. It is also unclear when the current study is performed as the time the research is performed is not stated in the paper.

The paper could be strengthened by description of the study design of the study and a specification of how the data are analyzed and combined.

The authors could use subheadings to support the structure.

Specific comments:

Title: The rationale for the aim of creating sustainable CCT is not well established in the paper - thus the title should be changed to cover the content of the study - and possibly the methodology.

Abstract:
Theory about implementation is missing - what are promising models and how does these inform the current study? Probably move ref 18 and 19 to the background.

Introduction: See overall comment above

Aim should be moved to the methods section.

Methods:

Description of design is missing.

The AIDED model is chosen; why? - this needs to be seen as a natural step following the background.

Different methods are used for data collection and need more description. How the data were analyzed (charts, observation and interviews) need more description.

Who were the stakeholder group in the innovate phase and the identified implementation champions - need more description.

Results:

A bit more data about the background data if possible: charts being reviewed (as age, gender, ethnicity, referral reason, type og health problems); informants, stakeholder group, champions (number, age, gender, e.g.); what type of network; should be displayed. Could be a table.

Discussion:

The use of the word "successful" was commented on in the earlier review. I would prefer that the word should be removed and changed to that "the AIDED model was useful in the process of creating an implementation tool kit".

It is unclear what sustainable referral is. Was there some kind of evaluation of the use of the toolkit during the last phase? If yes - this should also be included in the method section, and in the result section. If not, there is no evidence for sustainability and this word should be removed.

**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.
Yes

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

No

**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:

Acceptable
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