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Reviewer's report:

MINOR Essential Revisions

Thank you for the opportunity to review this report on a nominal group process designed to identify implementation strategies to improve the quality of palliative care. In addition to the comments and/or suggestions I have made in the attached file, the following changes are recommended:

Title: it would be helpful if the title followed the ‘Topic / question: design/type of paper’ and identifies the population / care setting studied format. If the focus is on improvement strategies, then this needs to be woven into the title as does the method for securing consensus.

Key words: add in consensus and/or nominal group technique

Method: Additional details about the nominal group technique ought to be added into the methods section. The role and/or position of the nominal group process facilitators also needs to be detailed and also whether the nominal group process was decided a priori. Additional details about how the integration of the qualitative and quantitative data is required.

Discussion: From an implementation perspective there is scope to mention some of the other key translational and/or implementation science constructs that are missing, particularly related to the evidenced based - behavioural change interventions. In many respects what is describes largely focuses on the dissemination aspects of the IMPACT research projects. It would be worth looking further afield at the implementation strategies adopted by the palliative care community outside of Europe, such as CareSearch, the palliative care knowledge network created in Australia. Whilst the article touches on, it does not go as far as exploring the implementation strategies that are need to be taken to ensure that widely held clinical practices that are subsequently shown to inappropriate are addressed in a timely manner - but to be fair this may have been beyond the scope of the original nominal group process, which appears to be largely focused on one major project.

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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