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Reviewer's report:

This is a systematic review of (mostly) qualitative papers in an area of potentially great importance and as such interesting to read, although it is unclear how the quantitative paper is used in the review, please explain.

The authors describe their approach very good according to the PRISMA guidelines and their findings.

However, I do have a concern about their use of the concept "continuity of care" and the setting for the different papers:

The concept of continuity of care is, as the authors declare, subject to different definitions and terms. It is unclear to me which definition the authors use.

Regardless of definition, the more continuity, the better for patients. This aspect is not mentioned clearly in the background and therefore the heading in the results (Continuity of care) is not clear.

Further, as the authors themselves mention the importance of health care systems but do not give any information regarding the reviewed papers setting regarding the system settings for the papers, it is unclear whether this is a phenomena that applies to primary or secondary care or both or more.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English  
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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