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Reviewer’s report:

This is a well performed and described qualitative interview study about a relevant topic for BMC palliative care.

I only have some remarks:

Methods:
- It is not totally clear to me what is meant with a 'normative need perspective' and how the authors used/incorporated this into the study design. Could this be elaborated a bit?

Discussion:
- This study is about patients with schizophrenia, but - as mentioned by the respondents themselves sometimes - much of what is found is (or might not be) not specific for patients with schizophrenia, but for patients with mental illnesses or even broader.. As mentioned by the authors in the study limitations qualitative studies aim to provide a level of validity whereby others can transfer ideas from one setting to another. I would appreciate if the authors already do this next step themselves in the discussion by adding a paragraph about which results seem specific for patients with schizophrenia and which seem more general for people with mental illness or other illnesses. There are earlier studies about palliative care (for psychiatric patients) that show similar 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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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