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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Probably - with minor revisions
GENERAL COMMENTS: Good points;

In relation to compassion I also find this point very important raised in the background - "there is some confusion over definitions, with compassion being conflated with related concepts of sympathy and empathy."

I concur with the point that - "there has been very little consideration of compassion in the LTC literature"

The aim of the study is clear - "The purpose of this focused analysis was (1) to understand and explore perceptions about compassion in the delivery of palliative care from the perspective of residents in LTC, their family members, and healthcare providers (HCPs); and (2) to identify potential facilitators and barriers associated with providing compassionate care to residents in LTC across Canada."

The selection criteria in Canada seems appropriate and varied and is representative; "The study was conducted in four LTC sites across Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, Canada. Sites varied in size, ranging from 50-284 residents per site, and varied in ownership, with three of the sites being 'for-profit' and one being 'not-for-profit'."

The interviewing guiding questions have also been provided.

Good that "Ethical approval for the study was granted by multiple University Research Ethics Boards"

Focus groups are a powerful way to perform qualitative research and also that in this case they have been transcribed verbatim and analysed thematically.

In the analysis - "While unanticipated, it became apparent at this stage that the subthemes within the theme of Conceptualizing Compassion were congruent with the key domains of the patient and healthcare provider model"

It is ideal that quotations from participants have been cited eg "Compassion is love…” (Resident, Focus Group #2);

The subthemes are appropriate and highlight the rigour of the qualitative analysis

So many important themes have been raised such as Inter-professional Compassion

This is such an important paper in relation to residents living in long term care (LTC) facilities.
I think this paper as it is written is an excellent and very important paper in relation to both compassion and end of life care.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Just for clarification, there should probably be the word Canada in the title or a short paragraph in the discussion to state what ramifications that this has globally.

It would be useful for the reader to know what are meant exactly by long term care (LTC) sites in Canada eg, compared to Nursing homes in the UK and Veteran facilities in the UK

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
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