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Reviewer's report:

The paper synthesizes results from a literature on multi-morbid patients' experience of integration of care. The topic is timely and important, the methods are well-described, and the authors provide a thorough discussion of the study limitations as well as of the policy implications of the results.

I have two main concerns about the paper.

First, I find the definitions of integration of care and continuity of care are unclear, which makes it hard to understand the main object under study: is it integration, continuity, or both? Do the authors view these concepts as interchangeable? In the introduction (manuscript lines 66-87), the authors discuss the different interpretations given to the notion of "continuity of care", and end with noting that they are going to study a simple definition of continuity. However, it was not clear to me what definition of "continuity of care" the authors adopted. Neither did I understand how the authors viewed the definition of "integration of care", or the relation between the two concepts. As these are central notions in the study, the authors need to revise the introduction to clarify their definitions of these concepts and how they view the relation between the two concepts.

Second, although I believe that the authors have made a reasonable synthesis of themes covered in the studies' interviews, I am left unsure whether the concerns raised by patients reflect their opinion on integration/transitions in general, or whether patients were reflecting on their general care experience. For instance, on lines 221-222 it is stated that "patients experienced integrations of services as successful when they had convenient access to their health care providers". Given that "convenient access" appears as a determinant of general patient satisfaction with care, ie irrespective of integration and continuity, I would like the authors to clarify that this and other statements were expressed in a situation when the interviews actually concentrated on integration of care etc. (In a nutshell: were they really talking about integration?) More generally, given that the review only included 9 studies, it should be possible to describe more clearly what the study goals were and what themes the interviews covered. Were the interviews specifically centered on integration, continuity, and or general patient satisfaction? Did all studies look at transitions between hospitals and other providers? Apart from elaborating more in this in text, it might be possible to add an extra column in table 1 title "Study objective" or something similar.
Minor comments:

* The authors should attach a list of the excluded articles.

* In the section Literature search, it would be convenient if authors described the publication years of the included study, to give a sense of the period covered.

*A few small language errors:

** rows 25-26: reads "The objectives of this review were to synthesis", should read: "... were to synthesize"

** row 27 reads "and to identified barriers towards continuity", should read: "...to identify..."

**row 80 reads "quality of live", should read "quality of life"

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.

Unable to assess

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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