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Author's response to reviews:

Authors response to comments/suggestions

Editor Comments:

1. Please include a statement on consent to participate in the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations.

If the need for informed consent has been waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the Board or a reference to the relevant legislation.

Authors’ response:

We have included a statement on consent to participate in the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations.

2. Please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.
Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If titles/legends are present within the figure files, please remove them.

Authors’ response:

We have now removed titles within figures and in the main manuscript, instead we have provided figure titles/legends under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References.

3. Please upload English language versions of all focus group guides developed specifically for use in this study as additional files. If the focus group guides are not yours or are already published by you, please supply references and/or links to them. Please also detail the questionnaire validation procedures.

Authors’ response:

The interview guide for the focus groups has been translated from Swedish to English and is now uploaded as an additional file.

Reviewer: 1

Overall the study provides a succinct and useful contribution to the literature by highlighting the enabling and participation precepts for occupational therapists working within palliative care. The methodology was appropriate to the research question as a phenomenological study.

Authors’ response:

Thank you very much!

There were a number of issues with written expression, and feedback on grammar, sentence structure and written expression are highlighted in the attached annotated manuscript.
Some general comments include:

* Replace the word "patient" with "client" (or other similar term) as patient denotes a medical model and is not consistent with international OT terminology.

Authors’ response:

We have replaced the word “patient” with “client”.

* At times the use of "they" and "this" is confusing as it is hard to know if you are referring to the OT or clients. Please just label what "they" or "this" is unless very clear.

Authors’ response:

The label “they” and “this” have been revised and clarified.

* Don't abbreviate OT, PC or FGD as it is confusing, inconsistent and saves few words. You could perhaps simplify FGD as just "focus groups".

Authors’ response:

Use of abbreviations is now deleted.

* The context (i.e., I'm assuming Orebro, Sweden) and any translation that may have taken place needs to be acknowledged and discussed.

Authors’ response:

We have included data about the context, and text clarifying that the focus groups were conducted in Swedish. No translation has been undertaken.
* The discussion would be strengthened by exploring whether your findings are captured in existing position statements or fact sheets about OT in palliative or end-of-life care from other jurisdictions (e.g., AOTA, CAOT, OT Australia, CPTOPR) as many associations have existing documents which may or may not already capture what you have found. If they do, then your research provides evidence to support these statements, and if they don't you may need to recommend what things may need to be added to these statement / guidelines (whilst acknowledge cultural and professional differences between countries).

Authors’ response:

The discussion is now revised in order to refer to existing statements about occupational therapy in palliative care.

* While I acknowledge that you have given some rationale for the study, this was not always clear. For example, your method simply captures what is already happening and doesn't necessarily mean that this is the best evidence-based approach. You may need to acknowledge that the approach simply captures the expert opinion of those already working in the area. It was also not entirely clear who would use this research and how? Is it to support a position statement? Is it to meant to support the development of a framework for OTs working in palliative care? Is it to articulate the OT role to other members of the multidisciplinary team?

Authors’ response:

The rationale is revised and we hope it is clearer now.

Reviewer: 2

This is an interesting paper and the authors are to be commended as there is no way I could write a paper in another language.

Authors’ response:
Thank you very much!

I have made some grammatical suggestions in text on the PDF. However, I did find it hard to follow at times, particularly the discussion and there seems to be overlap in the categories. I wonder if this has occurred during the translation from Swedish to English? The paper did not flow easily and I had to work hard to follow concepts and how they related to each other across the paper. It would have been helpful to link the discussion more overtly back to the research question and categories. I have made comments in text for the authors in all areas.

Authors’ response:

We have revised discussion for more fluent reading. We have also linked the discussion to the research question and categories in the result.

My other comment relates to the use of 'negative' (e.g. emotions) in the manuscript and again this may be a Swedish to English translation issue. "Negative" implies a value judgement and distress about dying or reluctance to take a piece of assistive equipment is not negative, rather a normal part of patient experience.

Authors’ response:

The word ‘negative’ is removed.