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Reviewer's report:
Thank you for the opportunity to review this very interesting manuscript from the Netherlands. My comments are included below.

Introduction
1. I would expect to see an overview of different models of care that use a team-based approach and reference to the models that are mostly used in Europe, in elderly care. This would increase readers' understanding of care aspects.

2. Existing literature on the GPs' roles and mission in teams, the barriers and the facilitators etc, is absent. There is no background information to justify the necessity to carry out this study. Why is this manuscript important? The authors need to provide evidence to support its added value.

3. There is plenty of recent literature to use. Please update the current literature.

Methods
5. The readers need to be aware of the Dutch context, the structure and organization of the health and welfare system serving the elderly in the Netherlands.

6. The sampling design is not very clear and well justified. The setting is not defined. The authors also need to set clear criteria for their purposeful sampling. How does the heterogeneity in the sample of participants serve the study objectives? The authors need to justify why they chose this sampling strategy.

7. Participatory action research (PAR) approach is mentioned as a term but not presented as a method. The authors need to indicate the PAR techniques in their study.
8. What did the 2 annual meetings with the participants served for?
9. There is much information included which is not appropriate introduced and explained. e.g.
   "….in the first round of focus groups, each team was asked to start a quality improvement project. In the second focus group, specific questions about that project were asked.” What is this project and how does it serve the study objectives?
10. The research questions at the introduction are different from those at the Methods section.
11. The instruments used does not exactly match the qualitative design of the study.
12. The mixed inductive/deductive analysis of data need further explanation. Why was it employed? Where and how is it applied?

Results
13. I am not sure whether the results provide answers to the research question initially described.

Discussion
14. The authors claim to have revealed a successful GP role but their methodology and study design does not allow such conclusion. The should also avoid generalizations.
15. The results need to be interpreted based on local context and policy.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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