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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
The question is not well defined. It is not clear why the authors want to combine teaching of palliative care for the older patients with teaching of an inter-professional team approach.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The method is not clearly defined. It is not clear how they proceeded nor why they proceeded in this way.

3. Are the data sound?
The data are not clearly defined as it is difficult to understand why the authors approached the subject in the way they did.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Not clearly.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The reasoning in the discussion is not structured. The conclusion is weak, bringing in new elements not present in the methodology.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
No.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, more or less.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No.

9. Is the writing acceptable? No. English becomes increasingly poor towards the end of the paper. There is no clear structure of the discussion leading to an overall conclusion in line with the reason why the research was set up in the first place.

The subject of the paper could be of interest, but as it stands it is difficult to understand its originality.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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