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Reviewer's report:

I think that this is a study with relevance for the Journal. It is of utmost importance to optimize the medical treatment for patients in home care, and this study is one step on the road.

Overall, the aim of the study is distinct and clear, the method is relevant for the aim and the GT method has been handled in an adequate way.

The presentation of the results are relevant and the conclusion is well based in the data.

Here are some comments that will further improve the article:

Minor Essential Revisions;
1. Abstract, p.3: Start the Conclusion with The patients in this study differed.....

2. Method, p.7: You write that memos were written directly after each interview. Why was this done? How did you handle these memos? Did you analyze them? If so, in what way? Please give the readers some information about this.

3. Four tables is included in the method. Can one of them be excluded? Described in the text? For example, many of the figures in Table 1 could easily be said in the text.

Are all definitions in Table 2 necessary? Can the descriptions be condensed?

Table 3; is it enough go give examples of questions in the text?

Table 4; Is it possible to number the patients from 1-15? When you read the results, it is a little bit confusing that a citation has number 19 or 29 when there was only 15 patients included.

4. Results, p. 9: I suggest to delete the Figure 1. All that information is repeated in Figure 6.

5. As the citations concerned, why are they referred to the patients and not to the participating FPs?? Would it not be more adequate to relate the citations to the single FPs characteristics?? For example the 2 first citations on page 9; these are not further understood by the knowledge that the FP talks about an old male with heart failure, angina etc or a 87 years old male with diabetes. Many of the citations reveal the beliefs of the FPs, which are interesting in relation to their
interpretation of the situation and their own possibility to manage the treatment. The authors may consider this.

6. Also, it takes an explanation in the text what the figures in the end of the quotes refer to, as an information to the reader.

7. I think that Figure 2-5 are fine to use in the result as they are the building cornerstones to the final model in Figure 6. I will though ask the authors to label all Figures.

8. I think that the discussion is well written and the strengths and limitations of the study is adequately discussed.

9. The paper is rather long and can be shortened, but if the length is OK with the editor, it is fine with me.
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