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Reviewer's report:

Strengths:

1) I appreciate the revisions that have been made since the original submission to strengthen the methodology section of the paper. As a result, it becomes easier to contextualize the actual intervention and how it led to some of the quotes engendered by the patients.

Limitations:

1) Please contextualize how your study's findings are unique from the prior findings in the literature. Although you have clarified that you simply want to describe the patients' experience of the music intervention, I'm not sure how your findings add to what is already known about music therapy in the palliative care setting. You have done a nice job of listing the evidence of prior studies that explain both the hypothetical and proven efficacy of music therapy. However, you only list these studies and do not explain how your results exist in relation to the preexisting evidence. Are they the same? Are they different? In other words, what makes your results special?

2) Please reconsider what approach you are using for your qualitative study. Taking a grounded theory approach is a bold assertion for a small study. Moreover, it's not clear to me what is the new theory about "music in palliative care" you actually have generated. Simply describing the "lived experience" of patients who received this intervention is more consistent with a phenomenology approach as opposed to grounded theory. If you decide to assert that the study is attempting to generate a new theory about "music in palliative care," please be explicit about what theory that is exactly and how your coding supports this assertion.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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:
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