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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript that report a systematic review of telehealth in palliative care. I offer the following comments and suggestions in my review.

This review provides an update from an earlier 2010 published review of studies restricted to the UK context. The protocol for this review has been registered with PROSPERO and the review is mostly reported according to the PRISMA guidelines. The search strategy appears appropriate.

Introduction- general comments: Some sentences are long to read (as a general rule, a max of 20-25 words helps the reader to easily grasp the content of a sentence). Some sentences are not supported by appropriate references. For example, the statement, "Supporting patients with palliative care need to access services in the community and avoid hospital admission requires increasing input and support by community general and specialist palliative care services." a reference here would be helpful. Reference is made to the UK digital service standard in the introduction and the discussions and it would be helpful for the reader for this to be briefly summarised.

Methods: The methods of the review appear appropriate. Greater explanation could be provided regarding how data were extracted and how assumptions and simplifications were made. In the PRISMA flow chart, there are two studies excluded for being the wrong study design. Earlier in the manuscript the authors state that all study designs, including case studies were included; please clarify this discrepancy.

The results, discussion and conclusions are justified.
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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