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Reviewer 1
This review of the revised manuscript will address only those changes made to the original submission.

Main Impressions
*The manuscript is much improved. This reader found it quite easy and enjoyable to read. Again, it addresses an important issue in health care in general and in palliative care in particular.
*The reorganization is much appreciated.

Abstract
*Edited and simplified abstract is indeed clear and easy to follow.

Background
*Aside from a couple of minor grammatical errors (e.g. Background is misspelled), which do not detract from the overall "readability", the background section is very well-written.
*Introducing the problem early on is an excellent way to engage your reader.

Methods
*The reorganized methods section is very much appreciated. The authors did an excellent job of addressing all reviewer recommendations.
*Entire section reads very well.
*Thank you for explaining your rationale for including only women in this paper. Of note, a later paper comparing the perspectives of men to those of women might be very interesting.
*Data collection processes so much clearer now.

Results
*Again, the reorganization is very much appreciated. The results are clear and organized to facilitate the reader's understanding.
*The most salient points are adequately highlighted by the authors.

Discussion
*Well done situating your findings in the extant literature and emphasizing your team's unique contributions.
*The authors' decision to include a subsection for implications is a good one. The only recommendation I have is to expand this section to include recommendations to your colleagues in education and clinical practice. Based on your findings, for instance, you might suggest that clinicians develop processes for eliciting patient and surrogates' perspectives regarding decision making and incorporate those into care.
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Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question (including the use of appropriate controls), and are the conclusions supported by the evidence presented?
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