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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well-performed retrospective chart-review on the use of palliative sedation in cancer patients.

Comments

1. 1)Page 3, line 44: Palliative sedation in this study is performed along a clinical guidance. Please describe this guideline (currently only referenced as webpage) in the introduction in more detail: does it give a clear definition of PS, does it include a written instruction about indications and carry-out of PS etc. This is particularly important as outcomes of PS a similar with and without the contribution of a palliative care team.

2. 2)Page 5, lines 1-6: for how many patients had there been no clear registration of PS? Was there a written indication at all in the charts? How many patients could not be included to missing or unclear data?

3. 3)Page 6, Table 1: p-values should be in the same line as the parameters they refer to.

4. 4)Page 7, Table 2: what was the definition of "incurable" as opposed "to metastatic". Is "existential stress" among the indications for PS in your hospital? Was it listed among "others" in Table 2?

5. 5)Page 8, line 55: where do the 36.5% come from? Has not been mentioned in abstract or results.

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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