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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. This review paper aims to highlight the need of alliance of palliative care with intensive care in present era, the barriers to the same, models proposed for their integration and various ethical issues. Overall, this study is well written. If authors complete minor revisions, the quality of the study will be further improved. 1. page 5: If the authors describe the various models of palliative care in more detail, it may be helpful to the reader's understanding. 2. page 5: "(C) Mixed model" : If the authors describe the "Mixed model" more specifically, it will help readers to understand.
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NOTES TO THE AUTHOR(S) I appreciate the opportunity to review this manuscript and hope my comments assist in the revision process. This is an important study in an under-researched area of the world. However, it needs a considerable amount of work to be publishable. Some areas need clarification as noted below:

- Expand the title to include the research methodology used in the study
- Situate the palliative care approach within the context of extant medical intensive care knowledge. Discuss the international relevance of the concepts and describe thoroughly the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.
- More actual evidence-based references should be provided:

- The article as it is constructed looks more like a reflection than a review. The main and fundamental purpose of writing a review is to create a readable synthesis of the best
resources available in the literature for an important research question or a current area of research. Given the approach to a narrative/integrative review it seems to me important to provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes (PICO acronym). - Identify the databases searched, with inclusive dates of the literature searched for each database and keywords used. Do not include when the literature actually was searched. - Discuss retrieval of references and handling, including inclusion and exclusion criteria (i.e., how the analysis was conducted, including judgment of quality of papers included in the literature review). I suggest a better explanation of the criteria for inclusion/exclusion (e.g. PICO method) used in the selection of the studies analyzed. Regarding the high number of initial referrals, it would be important to define whether this sample resulted in a basic research/individual from each descriptor or is an advanced search and resulted therefore the intersection of different descriptors (e.g. Boolean method). Present full electronic search strategy, such that it could be repeated. Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow PRISMA diagram. - Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigator. - Implications for practice/research/medical education need addressed in more deep. Identify implications/recommendations for healthcare providers, users, and policy makers as appropriate, and consistent with limitations. CHECKLIST FOR STYLE Organization and style: The manuscript is clearly written and will serve a broad audience of students, researchers, and practitioners.
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I believe that the review carried out has greatly improved the quality of the study. Also, I do think that the author(s) addresses the broad questions, appropriately which were asked.