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English

* Still some sentences that are not clear. For example, 'advising other health team'. Here do you mean advising other health team members, or advising other health teams. And on page 9 line 197 'agreed to enjoy" better to state 'they enjoyed working in pall care'. And page 10, line 222 'statement related to opinion on the extent of familiarity' this sentence would be clearer if you just said 'the extent of familiarity with managing various pain symptoms in pall care significantly differed'.

* in discussion 'barely 30% of pharmacists do not mind working in palliative care'. This sentence is clear. It would be clearer if you stated 'around a third of pharmacists state they are happy/comfortable to work in palliative care'. This is, so long as this does not deviate from the survey question.

* In discussion (page 13, line 276) you say 'unfold' the unmet', this explanation is not clear. Please revise

* Past and present tense confusion

* Singular and plural confusion (e.g. is and are). In discussion page 13, line 275 Healthcare provider, should read healthcare providers. Pains should be pain (page 13 line 282.

* Sentencing missing a word, e.g. page 8, third sentence should start 'The majority, 72 (65.5%).
"found to be familiar with experience of various' would be better worded as 'to be familiar with pain symptoms in palliative care

Abstract

Second sentence does not follow first. Perhaps something more like: 'This study aimed to explore the involvement in Nigeria of hospital pharmacists in PC. It sought to gauge their knowledge and attitude to PC and what may hinder their involvement'.

Method - need some information on what you mean as adequate or inadequate and also positive or negative.

Results: Need numbers in survey and response rate.

Background

I think the last section on this needs some revision. This is the section where you are stating why your research is important and needed and what it will achieve. You need to make it clear that you project is building on the references 28-30. You need to make it clear that referenced 16,30,33 are not from Nigeria. As it reads currently it looks like it is, and so you then wonder why your study is needed. When you state other resource-poor countries can you give an example country and a reference if possible. A final sentence would be good on how the information you gather could be taken forward (inform practice, policy perhaps).

Method

Can you say why you selected the three tertiary hospitals.

I don't think declining should be mentioned as an exclusion criteria. Perhaps instead you could say working less then one year in the hospital was the exclusion (and thereby delete it in the inclusion).

on page 7 first line (line 138) you sat you excluded another teaching hospital. Do you mean rather that this hospital was not involved in the study - if you did exclude it can you say why?

What is pharmacist grade one cadre? Page 9 the first paragraph has two sentences where it is unnecessary to state the number that did not. This is as it is obvious from the earlier section of each sentence the number that did not.

Results

Response rate 100% - well done - suggests the topic of the question was of great interest. Make sure you mention this strength in the discussion. Page 10, line 208 can you clarify whose lack of
awareness of need for pharmacists in palliative care? Was it the pharmacist, or hospital policy ....?

Discussion

First sentence would read better if you replaced 'showed' with 'had' and also instead of nearly 80% just give the actual % and likewise for almost 65% and approx 94%. It would also read better if the first sentence in the discussion reminds the reader what the aim of the study was. Then from the second sentence you present a summary of your key results. When you introduce O'connor can say where he/she is reported on the situation in Nigeria, and also the studies 14-16, 31, 32 etc. It is good you have detailed where you can if the research is from a developed/developing country. Here you refer to palliative care training of pharmacists - make sure you have adequately described current palliative care training in Nigeria in the background

Page 13, line 278. Sentence starting 'worthy of mention is the fact' word use and clarity of this sentence is needed. The sentence would benefit from being more concise and it is not clear to me how training without knowing why they feel sad with help. Instead you could say 'around a half of the pharmacists agreed with the statement that it is sad and depressing working with terminally ill patients. This finding needs to be further explored in research to understand reasons.

Sentence page 13 line 283 starting 'Nevertheless' does not flow from the sentence before it.

Sentence page 15, line 320 starting 'however' confidence issue should be confidence issues. Again, same page line 338.' though, this study provide' should read 'though, this study provides'
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