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Reviewer’s report:

Thanks to the authors for addressing the topic of advance care planning.

The article involves the description of a pilot which, importantly, moves away from just talking about the benefits of ACP towards a focus on how to bring this into practice. The involvement of nurses in this process is an important issue which deserves to be a subject of research.

Abstract

Clearly written

Background

The focus of the intervention is to address common barriers in the uptake of ACP, which is well explained. However, many healthcare providers also struggle with how to provide adequate ACP. Despite the fact that this is not the focus of the article, it would be good to address this issue.

- Note: The data this study is based on is rather 'old' (2014-20150. Hasn't ACP changed significantly since then?

Method- ACP intervention/Data collection

As noticed before limited information is provided about the experience of the participating nurses prior to the intervention, nor on the content of the one-day training which was provided.

As such the article misses information on the content of ACP in this intervention. On page 7 it is said that patients that completed ACP were approached. What is meant by completing ACP? It suggests that advance directives is an important outcome of ACP; the template suggests this too. It should be stressed that ACP is much broader that just advance directives, and that ACP should be a continuous process.
Results

- Page 8, lines 35-37: 13 patients consented to participate. What were reasons for the other 7 not to participate? It could be all patients dissatisfied with the intervention, which would lead to a selection bias in the results. This issue should be addressed in the discussion of the article.

- Page 9, line 1: why were two patients not offered the chance to invite family?

- Page 11, lines 7-17: For international readers it should also be clear what the status of AD's (and non-treatment directives) is from a legal perspective. This should be clarified in the article.

Discussion

It is clear that the ACP process is highly dependent on individual preferences; this is also shown in the results. Most of the findings are in line with other literature on ACP. The main conclusion here is that GPN's are capable of initiating and facilitating ACP conversations, which is in itself a very important finding. However, the discussion does not address how the content of the ACP intervention could or should be adapted to the findings and other existing literature on ACP in practice.

- Page 15, line 5-6: financial, legal and spiritual aspects of end-of-life are found to be important for some patients. What is the authors opinion on whether these aspects should be part of the ACP interventions?

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.

I am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal