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Reviewer's report:

A very interesting article on the important topic of what adult patients and family caregivers value about their experience of using UK hospices. The article is thorough and presents relevant findings that hopefully could lead to improvements in hospice care in the UK. The authors should consider several suggestions about improving the manuscript. The article is much too long and needs considerable tightening. The methods and findings can be significantly shortened while the background, introduction, and discussion could be expanded some. Having a better concise explanation of the previous work on this topic would help. I was sorry the authors limited their review to only UK literature as there is a rich literature on this topic outside the UK that is relevant to the findings of this study. In particular Karen Steinhauser's seminal article "In search of a good death: Observations of patients, families, and providers." Hospice care is evaluated against other providers in some sections but in others there is a direct comparison to evaluations of experience of care in the hospital. Would be good to identify the 'other providers.' The tables and additional information are excessive and unnecessary. Table 5 is perhaps the largest table I've ever see in a manuscript. The Journal might want to include it on-line or note it's availability from the authors. Thank you for this contribution.
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