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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. My comments are the following:

I would recommend to the authors to shorten the title to - The views of physicians and nurses on the potential of an electronic screening system for recognizing the needs of patients in palliative care

Abstract: Please spell out numbers when numbers are less than 10.

Introduction: The introduction is comprehensive with related literature embedded within the introduction. However, there should be no bullet points. Please integrate the material in the bullet points into the beginning of paragraph 2 of the introduction. Avoid language such as "this is where the publication comes in". The subheading 'Survey' is confusing, so please eliminate this subheading. The end of the introduction of the manuscript would be improved greatly if the authors referenced the 'My Support' project and explained more clearly/concisely the background to the 'MySupport' project - which would then lead in better to the next section - the Methods section.

Methods: The methods section would benefit greatly from a Table to summarise the participants (in addition to Figure 1 already provided). Please include at least - age, gender, profession, and palliative care setting in the Table. Please provide more detail as to the interviews (i.e. structured or semi-structured??) and more detail as to how they were conducted. Spell out SRQR and only abbreviate if the term is used again. Please include (in supplementary material) the interview guide which was used in data collection.
Results / Findings: The results section requires further (major revision) work. It is unclear if 'Use of Scales', 'Incomplete PROs' and 'Non-valid data' are subsections/subheadings under the main heading 'Estimation of data quality'??. If so, please present each subsection as a paragraph with its subheading.

Overall, in the results sections, the authors are advised to integrate more substantial quotes to support the key and important findings that are presented in this article. In the current version of the manuscript, the majority of the quotes don't fully contextualise / illustrate / support sufficiently the commentary in the results section. For example, in the first section 'Estimation of data quality' has very few and in most places, single word or simply two-word quotations to support the commentary. Any quotations provided should be of sufficient length to convey validity of the findings. Not every finding needs to be supported with a quote, but each 'subsection' of a section should have at least a meaningful quotation that best illustrates the key finding presented in that subsection.

Please rephrase the main heading 'Possibilities of recognition with the help of the system' so that it reads more clearly and concisely. Avoid alternating between 'physician' and 'doctor' throughout the manuscript. Best to be consistent and use the term 'physician'.

Remove the heading 'Conclusion' that is currently situated above 'Study Limitations'.

Discussion: Please note at the beginning of the discussion section - The discussion is in relation to the findings of the data reported on in this article (which is the data from the interviews) - not data from a 'survey'. The authors suggest here incorrectly that is the findings of a survey that is being discussed.

The Discussion heading should only read as 'Discussion' (Not 'Discussion of the results'). The use of numericals (1) and (2) where the authors are referring to levels, is somewhat confusing in the Discussion section of the manuscript. Please rewrite to integrate better the meaning that the authors are mean to convey here.
Conclusion: Remove "and outlook" from the heading 'Conclusion'

References: Please ensure that all references in the reference list at the end of the manuscript comply fully with BMC referencing style. There are some minor inconsistencies.

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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