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To: Prof Nils Schneider, MD, MPH
Associate Editor
BMC Geriatrics

Subject: Revised manuscript BGTC-D-17-00023
Nijmegen, 14 May 2017

Dear Prof Schneider,

Thank you very much for your reply to our submission. We greatly appreciate the chance to revise and resubmit our manuscript: ‘Collaborative goal-setting with elderly patients with chronic disease or multimorbidity: A systematic review’ (BGTC-D-17-00023).

Please find attached two revised versions of the systematic review (with tracked changes and with changes accepted). We carefully considered all the reviewers’ comments and adjusted the manuscript as described below. Furthermore, the entire manuscript was professionally edited by a native-English-speaking editor. Finally, we made some minor changes to the references.

Reviewer 1

Comment #1:
This a good written systematic review.

Response comment #1

Thank you for your compliment. We greatly appreciate your efforts in reviewing our manuscript.

Comment #2:

- The background needs to have a stronger alignment with the aim of this review (i.e. highlighting the necessity to do the review on the collaborative goal setting between pts and health care professionals). Are then any similar reviews? what are their findings.

Response comment #2

Amendments

Thank you for your comment on the alignment between the background and aim of this review. We agree with your comment and tightened our formulations. In addition, we added references to systematic reviews conducted on goal-setting in various rehabilitation settings.

Background section, lines 129-130 and 133-137, page 5

Comment #3:

- The criteria of evaluating the possible biases for each selected review paper are unclear, need to have more explanations.

Response comment #3

Amendments

Thank you for your valuable comment about our description of the methods for risk assessment. We agree that the criteria needed further explanation in the manuscript. We added information about the individual risk criteria to the figure (2) legend. In addition, we changed the order of the criteria in the figure according to the order in our reference: ‘Suggested risk of bias criteria for EPOC reviews’.

Figure titles and legends section, legend figure 2, lines 556-571, page 20

Figure 2: changed order of criteria

Comment #4:

- I am curious about when should be the best time, who would be the best person within the health care professional team to deliver this "intervention", etc. Could that be included in the discussion section.
Response comment #4

Amendments

Thank you for your interesting question. We share your curiosity on this subject. From our research, it became clear that the interventions reviewed showed common elements. In some interventions, these common elements had similar content. In others, the content varied. To respond to your comment, we added the variations in the common elements we identified of the different interventions. In this way, we hope to show both the correspondence and the variation in elements of interventions researched so far. Unfortunately, it is too early to provide general recommendations for clinical practice.

Discussion section, lines 395-398 and 400-406 , page 15

Reviewer 2

Comment #1

This study is well written and made a good effort in trying to identify and analyze studies about the effects of intervention supporting collaborative goal-setting or health priority setting compared to usual care for the elderly with a chronic health condition or multimorbidity.

Response comment #1

Thank you for your compliments. We greatly appreciate your efforts in reviewing our manuscript.

Thank you for accepting this revised version of our manuscript and considering it for publication. We greatly appreciate your time and look forward to your response.

With kind regards, also on behalf of the other authors,

Neeltje P. Vermunt, MSc, MD