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Reviewer’s report:

Minor essential revisions:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes with minor revisions

A few comments;

The wording of the sentence "(in 96% (N=197) of consultations" is confusing. Please reword it.

The sentence "if no internal distribution takes place"- should be reworded to make it more clear

The conclusion about the need for multidisciplinary care is good but please tie it to the data. for example, by pointing out that the patients typically had several needs including pain and also discharge care planning.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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