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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has gained in clarity. The strength of this analysis approach is now better to understand. However, some comments remain:

The Title “Guidelines for disease combinations: a useful strategy to manage multimorbidity?” too much focuses on guidelines. Please change it into a title that goes well with the results or the methods.

It could be only the second line of your title: “A practice-based analysis of combinations of diseases in patients aged 65 or older in primary care.” or, stronger focusing on the results, e.g.: “Analyses of multimorbidity must include social and psychiatric problems”…

Abstract:
It is important to highlight the social and psychiatric problems in the abstract, as their analysis is a strength of this study. Examples (Additions set in quotation marks):

Background: …. This study aimed to define which disease “and problem” combinations would….

Methods: … Main outcome measures were prevalence of disease “and problem” combinations and “their” association strengths.

Conclusions: The low prevalence of specific combinations, “the high prevalence of psychiatric and social problems” and the general….

Main Text:
Material and Methods:
“To reveal the combinations who occur…” Isn’t it better to use “that” or “which” than “who”?
The same line: prevalences were calculated…

Results: “… 39 problem pairs who….” Again: who or that or which?

Discussion: “… we believe the methodological approach was adequate to assess the usefulness of guidelines on guidelines for disease combinations.”

I don’t understand this sentence. This was not a study assessing the usefulness of guidelines. Only in the discussion you discuss that an individualized approach
might be more feasible than multimorbidity guidelines. But this only is a hypothesis.

The same line: “A main disadvantage of…”

Some lines below: “hampered due to the particularly”

Last sentence: “which in the end are relevant at practice…”

Acknowledgements: “for” better than “or”

Table 1: Please explain TIA and CVA.

**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.