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Reviewer’s report:

This article is focused on qualitative study of a local subject matter of high importance, but it can be considered as an issue for many other countries which have similar healthcare organizational settings and are in the same position in terms of Chronic Disease Management.

The authors had followed a good methodology considering various stakeholders and comprehensively approaching the problem.

There are few items that should be addressed to improve the quality of this paper:

1. The study was performed in two modes of focus groups and individual interviews. The demographic information about the focus groups are clearly mentioned but detailed information about the individuals is not clearly specified. Also, the numbers should be corrected as it was mentioned that 33 interviews were done: 35 in French, 8 in German.

2. Focus groups are performed with diabetic patients. No evidence was provided that the people living with diabetes are representative of all people suffering from chronic diseases.

3. The process of selecting patients from those who agreed to participate needs to be elaborated more clearly. The criteria are provided but the demographics of the selected participants should be presented too. This will help the readers to judge the generalizability of this study to their own setting.

4. It could be more methodologically accurate, if the two interviewers coded the transcripts independently and then compare their results to prevent individual bias rather than one person checking the work of the other researcher.

5. In the results section, the main focus of the article is on the common themes among various interviewees. Although the difference of opinions are specified, but in most cases the rationale behind those differences are not presented.

For example, this investigation is presented for incentives at patient level, where the reason for different opinions among physicians and health insurers with the rest of participants are discussed. The same approach should be extended to other parts to improve the article. Root Cause Analysis (RCA) is a good method to address this issue.

Also, two changes are recommended two improve the article itself:
1. The selection of keywords can be improved by matching the terms to MeSH keywords, e.g. Qualitative methods are worded as Qualitative Research

2. In the references some of the articles titles are presented in languages other than English. As this journal is published in English, translating these titles to English can improve the usability of them for all readers.
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