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Reviewer's report:

You have researched a very important topic globally and your findings are most valuable for policy development in many countries.

However, it seems to me that your effort to press your findings of qualitative data into May's Implementation theory makes for cumbersome reading. Why did you feel it is necessary?

It makes your findings and conclusions difficult to understand for an international readership. Your qualitative data clearly identify answers to the two research questions you pose. They tell us that communication with institution staff and MDs is often difficult; that there are legal and reimbursement barriers; that roles need to be clarified and possibly 'worked at' in order to avoid 'deskilling' of staff; that resistance of MDs needs to be addressed; that there are considerable benefits in terms of quality of life and health outcomes for old persons etc...

These are findings which are important also for other countries. May's theory might be most useful, alas, I can not see, why it is needed for a qualitative study. It would be helpful to have a footnote explaining the MBS subsidy scheme.
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