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Reviewer's report:
In the discussion of study limitations, the reviewer would have welcomed if the self-critical considerations would have gone into some more details: as the primary sample recruitment is highly selective („GP best practices“, awarded in a generic way by the researchers themselves which is not further justified), and as in addition the researchers' involvement is active („Participatory research“; member checking during feedback meeting), the door is open for mitigation through the research process and therefore for bias into direction of the central dictum (line 185f, „… GPs are the pivotal professionals in integrated elderly care because they coordinate the medical domain and have the ability 'to see the bigger picture'.”).

Discussion into more detail about other professionals of the team „having the ability 'to see the bigger picture'“ and thus taking the pivotal role and about the conflict between a GP's role definition as given here and individual GPs not being willing or able to fulfill this role may open the horizon for further research in this important field of future general practising.

Reviewer's recommendation to the authors:
Having an English native speaker to look at some wording may contribute to text being more translucent for your intentions. E.g. in line 36, instead of „The challenge is to tempt the GPs to take a lead …“ the reviewer expected „The challenge is to induce / convince the GPs to take a lead …“
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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