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Reviewer’s report:

An excellent piece of work - well written, designed and analyse.

Abstract: - Please explain what TRAPD model means

Method: when describing qualitative content analysis please refer to Hsieh method. Otherwise, this is generic terminology and it is unclear in what manner the analysis was conducted.

Results: Why did the participants consider more PC when using SPICT-DE - provide a summary sentence of what the deciding factor was.

Line 182: "written consent prior (include "to") participation

Under Data Analysis - again, describe whose version of content analysis you used, e.g. Hsieh

Under Assessment with and without SPICT-DE - give an example of PC actions recommended to illustrate what the GPs found helpful.

Under Quality and Feasibility of SPICT-DE: give example of which element of SPICT-DE was found to be especially helpful.

Line 337: take out comma after "said"

Table 6: QZB02 - quotation mark upside down

Table 6: QZBO3 - should be "advance" not "advanced" care planning

Table 6: QZB04 - quotation mark upside down

Under Using SPICT-DE in routine practice: explain the negative response (the 2 who didn't find it useful) - summary sentence of what they didn't like or didn't find useful.

Limitations: mention that this was heavily gender-specific, e.g. mostly females. Is this representative of the GP population in general? Of the GPs with PC experience in general? The gender of the focus group remarks of the 2 who didn't find it useful would be interesting to know.
Again, a very useful, well constructed and described piece of research.
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