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Reviewer's report:

This paper is a resubmission in which the authors indicate that they addressed the corrections raised.

I did not review the initial submission and I am unsure if it appropriate to raise additional issues at this point. However, I did want to identify an important finding from this research which can be further developed. The authors suggest that there is a lack of patient understanding and knowledge of non-communicable diseases thus impacting on their experience and management of health failure. This points to a wider epidemiological shift taking place in Sub Saharan Africa, a shift from communicable to non-communicable diseases (or the complex coexistence of both). Yet, patient experience and popular/ lay knowledge of illness is only almost exclusively of communicable disease and acute illness. Living with Long Term Conditions for a host of epidemiological, socio-economic, and other factors is not as widely experienced or researched - a situation which is rapidly changing. What this means for patient understanding of symptoms and this seeking treatment is an area for development. The discussion did tend to reiterate the findings rather than further develop the themes identified earlier (P16 lines 1-41). In the methods section bereavement interviews are mentioned but not explored in the paper. It is not clear if the patients were asked about their perceptions / understandings of palliative care?

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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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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