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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

What ethical approval was sought? Were participants who were observed aware of why their provider interaction was being observed?

In the Results section, the headings do not seem to fit the content below them. For example, the section headed, "How to give bad news" seems to be more about resources or environment that makes it hard to deliver bad news.

The results section would benefit from some quotes to support the findings.

Currently the discussion section is written more as a review of the literature rather than as a discussion section, tying the findings of the current study to the literature. I am also unclear about the list or outline nature of the organization of the discussion section.

At the end of both the results discussion sections, there is mention of language barriers. However, this is not explained at all in the rest of the paper. What language barriers exist?

The limitations section is very brief and needs to be increased.
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