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Reviewer's report:

The paper gives a good and interesting description of well thought out course. It demonstrates by showcasing the course that it is possible to set up a successful course outside of the conventional framing of medical education, both in terms of the physical surroundings, the learning environment in general, and the topics used as a vehicle to obtain the desired learning goals, in this case related to palliative care.

That is a positive and inspiring message, and I therefore recommend that the paper be published.

The paper does not, on the other hand, offer much in terms of demonstrating, render probable, or even discuss how well the described course format performs compared to other course formats. The main outcome of the course seems to be that the learners in general liked the course, and that they went from knowing not very much about palliative care, to being better informed and having a more nuanced and reflected view on these matters. That is good. But how good is it compared to more traditional courses in palliative care? Or compared to a course where the arts content had been replaced by actual clinical work in a palliative care unit? The comment is not meant to belittle or question the value of the described course. But it would strengthen the paper considerably if the authors address this question in their discussion of the course’s potential and success.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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