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Reviewer's report:

To authors:

Thank you very much for providing a meaningful manuscript. The findings and discussion from this pilot study would be useful for those who are planning similar studies.

Please note that I am not fluent enough in English to assess this manuscript from language point of view. I would like editors or other reviewers to comment on English quality.

Overall

1. Please justify why you compared these two sites (probably in the background section?).

Methods

2. It is understandable, but all most important and interesting which answers the study aims came from outside of figures in a result section. I am not sure if the patient and caregiver feedback in this study should be treated as results. However, otherwise conclusions you made seem not to be drawn from the data.

Setting and Sample

1. It is useful for readers if you could explain the background information of two study sites in 'Setting and Sample' section.

The ENALBLE CHF-PC Intervention

1. It is not clear if 'a comprehensive outpatient palliative care assessment' is the same as 'palliative care consultation' in abstract and 'protocol-driven palliative care consult' or 'outpatient palliative care consultations' in discussion?
2. Change a little comma after '[34]' in line 26/27 to the normal one.

3. Is reference [35] appropriate? It seems the title does not much the content of the description in a main text.

4. What is the 'interventionist script' in line 49 in 'The ENALBLE CHF-PC Intervention'? (Sorry this is my question but I could not get it.)

Data Collection and Measures
1. Please spell out 'SHFM' in line 11 as this is the first appearance.

2. I guess you are already aware, but I think it is not ideal the nurse coaches collected (?) for patient and caregiver feedback.

Results
Sample Characteristics
1. Could you review the way you presented the overall characteristics of patients in line 13-26/27? I would not like to comment on English expressions, but this seems not grammatically accurate.

2. SHFM survival probabilities in line 38-40 are mean for all patients?

Feasibility/Acceptability: Intervention and Measure Completion
1. It is really good to have patient and caregiver feedback relative to the intervention - this seems, in my opinion, the most relevant information to the study aims.

Resource Use
1. 'ED' (and also 'ICU'?) should be spelled out.
Overall results

1 Why did you compare outcomes between sites? They seem not that relevant to the study aims.

Discussion

* Precisely speaking, you cannot discuss selection bias in this study

Table 1

Not clear what figures in the brackets in Seattle Heart Failure Model and Charlson Comorbidity Index mean.

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.

Unable to assess

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

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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