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Reviewer's report:

There are replies to the many points made by the referees. Some points have been accepted, including the inaccurate numbers. But the text is hardly changed, paragraph by paragraph, reference by reference, with little recognition of the different literature and usages across the Atlantic. The idea of all non-governmental services as ‘private’, proposed by the authors, is an example. Palliative cancer care (hospice-at-home), not normally ‘private’ in UK, is just one area that I have researched – and appears under-represented.

The authors say ‘this project was written in tandem with several other papers’. These are not submitted alongside for us to assess any overlap. The editors have given the opportunity for resubmission, and the authors are happy with their paper. Just a correction, then, to the Abstract and again coherence with the numbers. The Abstract should include the word and the idea ‘iterative’, giving more detail on the steps from initial sweep to final inclusion. It reads too simply, and forgets – for example – the weak concordance between the two assessors (low face validity). Moreover, the revision has not removed the apparent Abstract error of ’18 databases’, 16 in the main text appendices 1 and 3, but again 18 at the bottom of p15. But how many were really used?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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