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Reviewer's report:

General
1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
Yes. The authors state the problem of rolling out an important aspect of palliative care (morphine for pain control), out to a rural population in a developing country.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work? The multi-phased character of the study is described, and although the methodology is very briefly described, most of the essentials are there. I miss some mention of the ethics of the study - who gave permission, and how was permission from participants, especially patients, obtained?

3. Are the data sound and well controlled? Yes, multiple methods were followed, and the results of each phase or method were described clearly.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes. The data is reported in sufficient detail for the reader to use it and compare other data with it.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes, the summary is useful, and clearly based on the results.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

I would suggest that the article be accepted after minor revision (adding some information about ethical issues).

-----------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-----------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

-----------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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