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Reviewer's report:

This small Swedish study in one health region investigates the provision of effective interventions to people with COPD in primary care and explores health care professionals' attitudes towards the provision of care to this group of patients. It utilises a mixed methods approach.

Overall the study asks an important and timely question and is appropriately designed. The methods are clearly described and presentation of the results is comprehensive. The discussion section (see below) in general addresses all key domains.

The following areas need addressing by the authors:

1. Methods, p. 5 96-100. There needs to be a more detailed description of the population of the study setting (total population, demographics, how they compare with Sweden as a whole).

2. Methods, p. 7, 157-159. It is unclear why the second survey was undertaken as the population overlaps with that of the interviewees. This needs justification.

3. Methods, P. 8, 170-173. This reports response rate. This is a result and should be reported at the beginning of the results section

4. Discussion, strengths and limitations, pp. 23-24. The limitations section needs expanding. The key issues are: a) that the findings may not be generalizable to other areas of Sweden; b) that the patient perspective is absent. This needs exploring further in subsequent research. Descriptions of patients "feeling shame" are health care professionals' accounts; not those of patients themselves.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**  
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**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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