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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a questionnaire analysis on the quality of palliative care perceived by the bereaving family caregivers depending on the patient’s place of death. In a model including characteristics of the patient, his disease and the relative, in patients who died at home quality of palliative care was perceived highest by the family caregivers followed by patients who died in institution of specialized palliative care.

The manuscript concerns on a clinically relevant issue. Presentation of previous literature and study methods is adequate, but there are some limitations in presentation and discussion of the results and the manuscript’s language. Overall, in my opinion, the manuscript could be suitable for publication in BMC Palliative Care after some revisions.

Title: I think e.g. a ":;" is missing between "hospice" and "relatives".

The main results are based on a statistical model, but this model is not described in the methods part of the abstract.

Results: perceived quality of palliative care was highest in patients who died in hospice (not at home). At first after including the influence of various characteristics within in the statistical model, quality was perceived highest in patients who died at home. This has to be clarified in the results part of the abstract.

The statistical analysis has to be described more detailed.

In the discussion, the authors talk about an "overall model". Is this the "model 4"? This should be clarified.

There are various wording that seems to be not correct in my opinion, although I’m not a native speaker myself: e.g. abstract "if they so wish" or discussion "more highly".
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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