

Peer Review

Review of: "Shared Medical Appointments for Multimorbidity: Harnessing the Relational"

Annette Peart¹

1. Monash University, Victoria, Australia

This is an important area of research, as I can foresee that many would be interested in how shared medical appointments are experienced by clinicians and patients. I would like to see the following changes to the manuscript to improve the rigour and trustworthiness of the results:

- There is a need to define multimorbidity for this context.
- Para 2 – it is hard to see how SMAs contribute to quality of life; please review that statement.
- I'm not sure of the relevance of discussing pharmaceutical solutions and then not continuing with that discussion.
- Please provide more information about where SMAs have been used in either general practice or other areas of medicine, and their results. Please provide more detail.
- The paragraph about the setting in the introduction probably belongs in the methods.
- Methods: While the authors state they referred to the COREQ, it is hard to find a lot of the information in the manuscript that the COREQ would refer to. Please provide a copy of the COREQ that points to where specific elements of the write-up are located.
- Methods: I'm not sure what the reflective voice notes were and how they fit in with the methods.
- Methods: Please provide more detail about the data analysis. If the authors followed Braun and Clarke, the findings would be written differently, that is, more thematically. More detail is required in the Methods to understand what the authors did to get from raw data to the written results.
- Results: Please present your results in a table format so that the reader can see what the difference is between an overarching theme and a "key area of interest." Are these sub-themes?
- Please also foreground the data extracts so that the reader knows whether the participant was a clinician or a patient.

- I was unable to review the manuscript beyond the methods, as I am not certain that the type of analysis that was intended to be used is supported by the results as they are currently presented. I would be happy to review another version where it is clear that the analysis was thorough and came from the participant data, not just what appears to be categories of findings. Braun & Clarke have more recent guidelines than the 2006 paper.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.