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**Reviewer's report:**

This article describes the work conducted with Palliative Care Evidence Review Service (PaCERS) to produce timely evidence-based information for clinicians. The article is well written and interesting, but it would be more suitable as non-research article.

Few comments:

- I would recommend using the updated version of the definition "Evidence Based Practice is the integration of clinical expertise, patient values and the best evidence into the decision making process for patient care" - Evidence-Based Medicine: How to Practice and Teach It.

- I am not sure if 'health technology assessment' counted as rapid reviews.

- Authors should clarify whether the members of the review advisory group are different based on the assessed review or fixed? And how many members?

- Who defined the scope? Has it been defined during the one day workshop? Or is it based on table 1?

- It would be interesting to learn how they actually engaged the clinicians to ask clinical questions. Authors briefly mentioned this in stage 1, but more details would be helpful.

- The authors reported that they have developed a set of search terms related to palliative care and cancer. Have they evaluated its performance?

- Authors should clarify the degree of involvement of the 2nd reviewer in full-text screening and data extraction. Is it limited to a random sample or cross-checking all articles? If that's the case, why not being independent?
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