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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I hereby offer the following specific evaluation.

1. Purpose
“How do terminally-ill patient and family physicians initiate decision conversations about palliative care options in a hospital-based palliative care team?” (lines. 128-130)
The meaning of this sentence is too wide and ambiguous.

2. Ethical consideration
This study deals with very sensitive situations.
How did you ensure that ethical considerations were followed and the research procedures were sensitive to participants?
What steps were taken to ensure that the data collected were not subject to any bias?

3. Data analysis
The details of the data analysis procedure are insufficient. There is no information about the procedures to ensure the reliability of the data interpretation.
You could refer to relevant theory or literature in the field that would serve as evidence.

4. Result
It is better to devise a way to distinguish the interpretation of the data from the reporting of the actual data, such as a “change of font” and a “change of paragraph.”

5. Discussion
The content of the discussion is not sufficient.
There are many previous studies on decision-making with respect to end-of-life care. However, in this section there is no discussion of the results of this study in comparison with the results of previous studies.
6. Conclusion
The conclusion is too long. In the conclusion section, one must describe only the important conclusions of the study.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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