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Reviewer's report:

I wish to commend the authors for an interesting paper and chasing up so many health services - the ethics must have been challenging!

There are some concepts you describe that may be a function of translation into another language. Patients having "negative and positive attitudes" attributes a value judgement to actions that can lead to labelling of patients who may simply be in a stage of adjusting to deterioration rather than being negative. Adjusting to rapid deterioration is really confronting and takes time. Integrity - I wonder if dignity is a more accurate interpretation of this given its relation to toileting etc.

Given the size of the focus groups I wonder if they can be called focus groups? Would they be better conceptualised as group interviews?

You also make reference several times to policy documents but these are not identified. There are several evidence informed position statements on the role of OT in palliative care, the American position statements have had several iterations. It would be helpful to consider this in your discussions given your claim OT strategies (or interventions?) need to be described in relevant documents. I have made other comments in text.

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.

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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