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Reviewer's report:

The authors should be commended for attempting to evaluate their PPC program but I have serious concerns about the methodology employed.

Major issues:

1. This is badged as a cohort study, is it or is it a case-control or matched cohort study?
2. They comparator group was originally 348 deaths but 260 of these were excluded, why?
3. Inclusion criteria; it is unclear at this point in the text whether only children who had died in either group were included?
4. I have concerns about excluding children who died less than 30 days after admission, and those who died elsewhere. Please justify.
5. How well are ACP discussions documented? Is it possible that these discussions happened but were not documented?
6. The control group (table 3) are clearly different from the PPC group so can you compare these?
7. The text is not easily readable, I would suggest an English language expert assist with any redrafting.
8. The HUI has not been validated in this population, please justify as it is a tool for caring for those with dementia.

Minor Issues

1. If parents were offered PPC and declined which group were they included in?

There are also issues with the interpretation of some of the statistical analyses and some of the discussion.
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.

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 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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