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Reviewer's report:

This qualitative semi-structured interview was aimed to reveal the essential elements of high-quality palliative care at home.

The result seems to have good implication, though there might be better to clarify the several points which described below.

1. It might be better to described the interview methods; "the patient and their relative (partner or daughter) were interviewed – separately from one another" which was described in Result section, in the data collection section.

2. It would be better to clarify the reason and rationale to make schematic diagram which was presented in Figure 1. If possible, author could present the references or the details of discussion between the authors.

3. It would be better to explain the Figure 1 with more detailed description in footnote.

4. Authors should clarify the answer of RQ: Does the actual palliative care provided match what these patients and their family consider in discussion section or conclusion.

5. As authors mentioned this study was conducted in one country with small number of patients who might have good relationship with their GP, it might be better to describe the limitation of this study clearly in terms of generalizability.

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.

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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