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Reviewer's report:

General
This paper is well done. The method and results are very appropriate to meet the needs of this constituency. This approach is sensitive and targeted to the perceived needs of both health care providers, patients and caregivers in palliative care situations.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The reader would benefit from more explanation of the method. Citing the texts does not provide enough detail. In particular the reader would like to know what criteria were used and how you choose and recruited the stakeholders. Also needed is the format of the focus groups, what general questions were asked, how was the information processed, analyzed or evaluated, and who moderated? Was the final content decided by consensus? What did you do when the groups had different views and disagreed? For example, when providers and carers disagreed on what is the appropriate information needed, or did they always agree? How did you decide on the content and sources of the evidence based reports? This is important to assure that everyone's view was considered.

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?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests