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Reviewer’s report:

This is an interesting study combining elements of case series, chart review and qualitative focus group discussions to identify quality of care deficits for patients with multimorbidity in the Danish health care system. However, there are some issue that need to be addressed.

My biggest concern is the small sample size of only 23 patients. This even gets more relevant, because only only eight chronic conditions are used for patient selection. Multimorbidity is a very complex condition with a very large number of possible disease combinations and interactions between diseases, treatment regimes and medications. I therefore recommend a more careful declaration of study limitations. I strongly advise the authors to delete the sentence "The findings from the sample can thus be generalized to the population of people with multimorbidity." (pg. 13, ln. 11-14). This is contradicted by the small sample size and the small number of selected diseases - and it is not needed as the identified quality of care issues are relevant even if there are patient groups not covered from the study. Additionally I strongly advise to delete the sentence "because clinician review revealed recurring patterns, it is unlikely that including more patients would have altered the findings." This statement is not conclusive, because recruiting a broader range of patients (regarding the disease spectrum) might also have resulted in more differentiating categories in the focus groups. In this regard it is also needed to mention the small disease spectrum as a study limitation. If I understood the authors right, they conducted three focus groups, but each with the same personnel. If this is true, they also need to introduce this as another study limitations as usually additional focus groups also include additional people.

Besides these revisions I also recommend to start the methods section under the heading design with an intial statement that summarizes the complete design (case series vs. chart review vs. focus group discussions vs. evaluation of medication regarding start/stopp and other criteria etc.). The authors are also advised to sort the results section a little more with regard to the methods used. The way it is written now, it is difficult to understand and really needs some improvements in readability.
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
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