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Reviewer’s report:

I think this manuscript is fine and can be accepted now. The authors may just want to have a quick look at the very minor comments below:

Page 4: Please complete the sentence: "The Northern X Regional Ethics Committee of New Zealand"

Page 6, bottom: I think this sentence could still be helpfully restructured and would suggest "The five-point EOL preferences items were collapsed into three categories, 1: "not important"; 2: "moderately important (combined 2+3); 3: "very important" (combined 4+5)"

Page 8: I may just be misunderstanding, but this initially states that there were no significant differences (p>.05) between the participants who answered yes to the comfort question based on - " and then the results reported indicate that there were significant differences in terms of gender (p=0.004) and marital status (p=0.012). This may require clarification; if I am confused, others may be as well.

Page 8: Re "Non-Māori participants were also predominantly female (49.5%) and over the age of 87 (100%)": I would suggest slight amendments to the sentence as the % here would suggest they were not predominantly female, and the 'also' may wrongly give the impression that the age predominance works in the same direction for Maori and non-Maori.

Page 10, Non-Maori section under Preferences heading: I would suggest to move the sentence "Chi-square tests of independence were performed -" further up, and to review the punctuation for the results in this section.

Page 12, line 2: closing parenthesis required.

Are the methods appropriate and well described? If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls? If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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