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Reviewer’s report:

Thank you for submitting this paper which is a relevant and important issue within the developing field of children's palliative care. The study clearly redresses a gap in the growing evidence base that is underpinning children's palliative care. I found the paper an interesting read but I do think a few aspects need further unpacking to really hammer home the value of the study.

Background can be strengthened if you broaden the literature to include other UK countries as well as internationally contextualising this issue. You discuss the Strategy for England but no others, I am sure they mention such issues.

Methods - some further justification would enhance this section for me. Why was a certain number of participants decided upon for focus groups? Why was the paed oncology topic guide used? How was it useful? What was included? I am wanting to know more.

More information about ethical considerations and support.

Results

Are the themes identified combined from FG and interviews, how did this come about and why?

I think the link between subthemes and themes could be more slick, they could be less 'clunky' and written in a more integrated way.

Implications for practice, research, education and policy could be hammered home more clearly. The 'so what' element of the study needs to be developed further, through the discussion and also the conclusion section.0

I think this is an important topic and it with some revision could make an very nice published paper with necessary revisions.

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
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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