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Dear Editor

I am pleased to resubmit for publication the revised version of manuscript (PCAR-S-18-00066) "Healthcare professionals’ views of palliative care for American war veterans with non-malignant respiratory disease living in a rural area: a qualitative study.” We are very grateful to you, the editorial team and the expert reviewers for taking the time to review our manuscript and for providing valuable and constructive comments. We provide a point-by-point response to each comment below.
Response to Editor Comments:

Minor revisions required.

Methods

1) In the last request for revisions I noted…

• Not sure how a notetaker aids “accurate recording of focus groups” – a notetaker would, however, be able to record non-verbal behaviours or act as a backup should audio-recording fail.

The revision (R2) now says:

• “A member of the project team fulfilled the role of note taker to aid accurate transcription of the focus group”

I think this is still unclear/ a bit meaningless. If you still want to include this sentence it would be better to say some version of (depending on what you purpose was):

• “A member of the project team fulfilled the role of note taker to record non-verbal behaviours and act as a backup should audio-recording fail.”

Thank you for highlighting, this sentence has now been removed as suggested.

Limitations

2) In the last request for revisions I requested…

• Line 554 – add in informal carers to this sentence “Findings only represented the perspectives of HCPs and not the patient’s own perspective”

The revision (R2) now says:
• “Findings only represented the perspectives of healthcare professionals and not the patient’s or informal carers own perspective”

The apostrophe on patient is in the wrong place as presume this should be plural (given that health care professionals and carers are plural).

Apostrophe deleted

3) In the last request for revisions I asked…

• Are there likely to have been any changes in palliative care provision since the data was collected in September 2014? As that was over four years ago some comment on this would be helpful.

The revision (R2) now says:

• “It is important to note that hospice services have increased from this study was conducted with 4382 Medicare certified hospices in operation in 2016 [46], and there are now 50 for profit hospices located in Idaho”

Think there is a word missing as “…from this study…” doesn’t make sense.

Changed to:

“It is important to note however that the present study was conducted in 2014. An increase in hospice services has been noted from 2014 with 4382 Medicare certified hospices in operation in 2016 [46], there are also currently 50 for profit hospices located in Idaho.”