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In this manuscript, the authors describe a case series of 23 patients with multiple chronic conditions to characterize the appropriateness and quality of care for their chronic conditions. The authors obtained charts for these patients from hospitals, GP offices, and municipal health care providers; the charts were reviewed by physicians (both GPs and specialists), community nurses, and clinical pharmacologists using a questionnaire and focus groups.

This is a very interesting issue and one that is certainly receiving a lot of attention in the literature right now. I also think it is a strength of the paper that the authors were able to obtain so much data - and it seems detailed data - on the patient participants. However, I also found that there were a number of issues that I think the authors need to address. For me, the biggest issue is the general lack of detail, in particular in the collection of data on quality of care. Here are more specific issues that I would like to see the authors address:

1. I found the Abstract to be somewhat confusing. I did not understand how the authors came to their results and conclusions based on what was described in the methods section. I think that once the authors add detail to other parts of the manuscript, they should revisit their Abstract to be sure that it better reflects what they had done.

2. This is relatively minor, but I think that there is too much information on the Danish Healthcare System. I think that readers really just need a good sense of understanding who is covered by the public system, what it covers, and what this means in terms of data completeness for a study such as this one.

3. Under Design, the authors state that selected patients were required to have 2 or more of a set of the most prevalent chronic conditions among adults in the Danish Capital Region. What is this estimate based on? Is there a report or some other research that can be cited? Similarly, under the Population section, the authors state that they selected 133 people with the same age and gender distribution as the population but do not explain where this comes from.
4. From 133 selected individuals, only 23 (plus 1 used for pilot testing) were included in the final sample. Was this low participation expected? If not, can the authors comment on any concerns about bias?

5. I was unclear on exactly who participated in the focus groups. Did specialists only comment on patients with conditions under their specialty? What about the GPS and nurses? I could not tell how many focus groups were held, how many attended each group, or how many patient records were reviewed per group. More detail on this aspect of the study would be appreciated.

6. Related to the above, there is not enough detail on the process used to obtain the medication reviews. For example, did both clinical pharmacologists review all patient records? If so, how were disagreements handled?

7. Further to both above points, I think that the authors need to provide much more information on how "quality" of care was evaluated by the clinical participants. Were these based on guidelines, other standards, etc? Were clinical participants provided the questionnaire shown in Table 2? If so, do the authors have their responses and could this be included in the results somehow? As of right now, there really is not information to gage exactly how the authors collected their data, or even what kind of data they were collecting.

8. What is an "episode of care" in this study? Each physician visit? Hospital stay? More definition is required.

9. The findings from the focus groups seem interesting but I think that the authors could delve into these issues - and the participants' perceptions - a little more. I wonder if it would also be possible to link some of the clinical participants' comments regarding barriers to care to the patient issues under discussion (while being mindful of patient privacy). I think that it would be of interest to readers to see some examples of how single chronic conditions among patients with multimorobidity.
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