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Reviewer’s report:

Using qualitative research methods, the paper explores the views of Dutch stakeholders on achieving a biopsychosocial approach to chronic care. It is a well written and interesting paper and I enjoyed reading it. Some recommendations, though, should be taken into consideration to improve the manuscript.

In the background section the authors do not state why stakeholders were chosen for the study. To give a rationale for this choice will improve the overall line of argument. The question that arises is: Why are you interested in stakeholders’ views and not primarily in patients’ views and experiences. A clear justification will also strengthen your conclusions.

As far as methodological issues are concerned, I have several comments. I would like to get more information on the way, interview partner were selected: Where did you find them? How did you got to know them?

Further, I miss a more detailed description of the sample. The authors merely give information about their function; information about e.g. age, gender, social background are necessary, too (the same is true for the quotes referred to in the results section).

I have concerns about the fact that only parts of the interviews were transcribed and analyzed: How many people decided which parts to transcribe? How, in detail, was this choice made? Proceeding this way, the authors produce a source for bias that might have impact on the results obtained. Given the fact that a semi-structured guideline was used (as compared to an unstructured interview) this procedure is even more surprising. Please describe and justify how, in detail, you handled this procedure. Furthermore, it would be good to add the guideline to the appendix.

As a methodological approach the authors refer to content analysis. However, throughout the paper the authors refer to Grounded Theory (GT) literature focusing furthermore on GT characteristics such as data saturation. At this point, the paper needs clarification.

Since analyses are based on interview extracts and interview summaries, I would like to know, how these summaries are structured: How detailed are they? Who and how many people wrote them? Did more than one person write a summary on a single interview?
I was very surprised reading that the authors conducted another 16 interviews although data saturation was reached after 14 interviews! I wonder whether data collection and data analyses were a circular process and how it came that the authors conducted so many more interviews. The information given on p. 7 (The remaining interviews served to obtain representative data of the phenomenon ((which is not possible in qualitative research by the way)) under study and to fill the categories.) is little convincing. Please clarify that point.

As far as limitations are concerned I miss a critical note on the invitational conference’s power to confirm the results: Whenever there is a group of people discussing a certain topic, some people tend to overstate their opinion while others tend to refrain their thoughts. This might have impact on the results contained from such a conference and should be mentioned.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests