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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the revised manuscript. It is a much improved manuscript and is much more focused and concise. As it has been so radically rewritten I’m afraid a few comments may be new (i.e. weren’t raised in first review).

**MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS**

**Background**

1st paragraph

Do you have a reference to the comparison of trajectories CHF/cancer?

You rightly mention that service models have been framed on cancer care- there are several papers published reviewing the models/provision of CHF palliative care in the UK.

Final sentence- it is not so important to write a paper that adds to the literature but to add to knowledge.

**Results**

To assist the reader to know that your 20 respondents were not from a single region you should state where participants were from with respect to your diverse study settings (which is a strength of your study).

**Discussion**

It is very important to incorporate the literature on validity of retrospective information collected in bereavement stages in palliative care research.
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