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Reviewer's report:

This is a timely and well-written qualitative investigation. There is currently much interest in the delivery of COPD discharge bundles and this study is, potentially, an interesting and original addition to the literature. I have noted the following minor points that I would recommend that the authors address.

1. Abstract: The content in the conclusion of the abstract could be more focussed and more specifically reflect the findings of the study.

2. Line 70-72 please clarify where COPD is the most common reason for admission Do the authors mean worldwide or in Canada specifically?

3. Please clarify why there were no patient focus groups completed in the rural setting - was this because of practical issues?

4. Please could the authors add some detail as to why thematic analysis was selected?

5. There is a typo in line 212 's'

6. The supporting quotation in lines 337-339 is a little confusing and perhaps needs some additional context in the text so that the reader can understand it's relevance.

7. Please check for errors with apostrophes in lines 353 -361.

8. There's a mistake in the presentanion of a reference in line 430 (ON/UK?)

9. Line 463: the authors suggest that a limitation of their study is that it was "…conducted prior to finalization and implementation of a provincial standardized COPD discharge care bundle. It would be helpful to reader if the significance of this was clarified.

10. Table 2: Please clarify what is meant by FG05 and FG09. I presume this refers to 'Focus Group'?

11. Figure - the quality of this image is not optimal - can this be improved?
**Level of interest**
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

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

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal