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Reviewer's report:

The study is a reevaluation of the subgroup of multimorbid patients from a previously published trial. Although the research question is interesting, the way the paper is written now, I find results and interpretation of results do not add anything relevant to what is already known. The authors try to evade the question why the patients perform better in certain categories and do not improve in others. Together with the fact that patients from control somehow also improved during intervention time, the effects of the intervention seem quite arbitrary. The same goes with the implications of the study. Although the answers to my comments includes a statement that implications have been added I find no hint of what study results mean for clinical practice or research - except for the fact that the authors wish that further research helps them to interpret their results. If there really is no way to tell how the intervention affected the patients and if there are no relevant implications of the study then there is little that readers can learn from this study.

That's a pity, because I think with a little more discussion of these relevant aspects the paper could significantly improve.
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