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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Editor Comments:

Thank you for your revised submission to BMC Family Practice. I am sorry for the delay in informing you of our decision.

In addition to addressing the reviewers' comments below, please address the following editorial points:

- Please consider including the table listing all included papers within the manuscript rather than as an appendix.

Authors' reply: We have replaced Table 1 to list all 26 included papers as well as capture the model of group clinic for each paper.

- In the Availability of data and materials statement, please reference your list of included papers and search and exclusion criteria.

Authors' reply: Added.

- Please renumber the appendices in the order they are first referenced in the manuscript.
Authors' reply: We made an error referencing Appendix 5 (inter-rater reliability results) in the Methods section, as it appeared again in the Results section where it belongs. We have removed the erroneous reference to Appendix 5 from the Methods section. The numbering is now correct.

- Thank you for including the PRISMA checklist and the protocol. There is no need to include them with the revised manuscript.

Authors' reply: Thank you.

- If the protocol for the systematic review was registered, please provide a reference number. Otherwise, please remove the reference to the protocol from the manuscript and include all needed information in the methods.

Authors' reply: Since a protocol was not registered, we have removed reference to it in our manuscript. Also, we confirmed that all needed information is in the methods.

2. Reviewer 2 (Boehmer) Comments:

The author's have responded to the majority of the request for revisions adequately. I have a couple of minor remaining revisions I would suggest prior to publication:

1) The authors mention that they referred to Sandelowski and Creswell in their protocol. However, I do not see a protocol citation. The authors should cite the contributions of Creswell and Sandelowski in their methods section or they should cite their protocol paper. If I have missed the protocol paper citation, I apologize. A call out would be helpful.

Authors' reply: Since a protocol was not registered, we have removed reference to it in our manuscript. We have also added citations for Creswell and Sandelowski in our methods section.

2) The discussion section is still a bit problematic from my standpoint. I struggle with two things:

   a) there is no brief section summarizing their overall findings, and assists the reader in understanding the key points and the structure of the remaining discussion sub-sections. By the time I get to Patient Experience of Care in discussion, it feels very long.

Authors' reply: We included a Summary of Findings, utilized more standard section headers, and moved certain paragraphs to improve the structure of the discussion for better flow.
b) The discussion subheadings also do not follow the same logic of order presented in the results section, which also could help the reader better follow along.

Authors' reply: As above, we utilized more standard section headers and moved certain paragraphs to improve the structure of the discussion for better flow.

3) In the conclusion section, I believe the second sentence "Accepting and implementing this nontraditional approach by both patients and clinicians can yield measurable improvements in patient trust, patient perception of quality of care and quality of life, and relevant biophysical measurements of clinical parameters" should be prefaced with the clause "as judged by this mixed-methods systematic review.

Authors' reply: Edited accordingly.