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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. The authors report a systematic review of international palliative care research priorities. It is a well written paper, and the findings are useful, if not particularly surprising. For me the most interesting aspect was not 'what are the research priorities' but 'what methods, settings and participants have been used, and how can we improve these processes in future'. This latter aspect comes out very well in the discussion, though could be strengthened with inclusion of some specific recommendations for future priority setting exercises (see below).

I have only minor comments:

Abstract - There is a word missing in the first line of the results - the search yielded 10,325 what?

Page 5 line 27 - 'spurned' is not the right word - do you mean 'spurred'?

Page 9 line 29 - I am very confused about how there are 3738.03 stakeholders. The footnote does not adequately describe how this can be. Also, two decimal places seems inappropriately precise.

Page 9 line 36 - as above 1902.28, and at other places in this section

Page 10 line 51, there is a "("
Discussion - could the authors comment on the generalisability of the findings a little more, i.e. the risks of generalising from high income settings to low income settings.

Discussion - could the authors strengthen their implications for policy and practice by making some recommendations for future priority setting exercises? Both in terms of the methods and the participants (and possibly a reflection on settings).

**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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