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Reviewer's report:
This is an interesting piece of work and very applicable to the field. The authors have taken into account most of the revisions requested and the paper definitely reads better as a pilot study. However there are a few things that I don't think have been addressed properly and need to be addressed prior to publication:

Major revisions required
* I still think that there is an issue with the time frame - whilst I recognize that this is in line with the 10 day waiting period - to me this is not the issue. The issue is that it is not realistic for the impact of the palliative care intervention for those new to palliative care to be realized in that time frame. This should be discussed.
* I still think your conclusions are too strong for a pilot study, and without ongoing exposure to palliative care. e.g. you start your discussion with the sentences 'Our results suggest....." - whereas in the conclusions you have written it in a more appropriate manner e.g. "This pilot study suggests that...."
* In your conclusion you start talking about an expanded definition of palliative care and I don't think this is appropriate on the basis of a small pilot study and should be removed.

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.
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.
Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Acceptable
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