

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-22-1257>

### Reviewer A

**Comment 1:** Subsection on objective. As it stands now, the objective looks like a problem statement. Can the authors explicitly state the objective of this study? I note the aim has rather been stated under 'Methods'. Move this to the sub section 'Objective'

Avoid abbreviation in abstract (write PCU in full).

**Reply 1:** Thank you for your comment regarding the abstract. We have moved the appropriate statement regarding the aim of the study into the "Objectives" section. We have also spelled out "PCU" in full (Palliative Care Unit) to remove abbreviations.

**Changes in the text:** The above changes were made in the text, please see Page 1, line 7-12; Page 1, line 13-16 for the abbreviation removal page 1, line 11

**Comment 2:** The acronym for end-of-life care is (EOLC) and not EOL

**Reply 2:** Thank you for this. We have edited the document to include the appropriate acronym of EOLC when referring to end-of-life care.

**Changes in text:** Page 3, line 41, page 4, line 74, page 5, line 111, page 9 206, page 10 line 234 and 235, page 11 line 269, page 13, line 309

**Comment 3:** Additional relevant references to Background

**Changes in text:** Please note that we have incorporated all four suggested references into the background section of the paper and have referenced them accordingly

1) Salifu & Bayou (2022) Transfer and transition between palliative care settings. *Annals of Palliative Medicine*, 11, (10), 3035-3039; 2) Mertens et al (2022). Patients experiences of transfers between care settings in palliative care :an interview study. *Annals of palliative medicine*, 2830-2843. 3) Salifu et al (2021). My Wife is my doctor at home: A qualitative study exploring the challenges of home-based palliative care in a resource-poor setting. *Palliative medicine* 35(1), 97-108.4) Bayuo et al. (2022) "Resuscitate and push" End-of-life care experiences of health care staff in the emergency department-A hermeneutic phenomenological study. *Journal of Palliative Care*, 374(4), 494-502

---

**Comment 4:** Authors should avoid terms such as 'our organization', 'our facility' etc. as it may not make this paper appealing to international audience.

**Reply 4:** Thank you for this insight. We have removed as often as possible reference to "our organization", and "our institution" and have reworded the appropriate sentences so that it reads more formally and appeals to a broader audience.

**Change in text:** Referring to the "our" has been removed from the entire text.

**Comment 5:** Ethical considerations: Authors should add the Ethical approval number

**Reply 5:** As this was a quality improvement project, our organizational requirement is that the project is assessed via an Ethics QI tool named Ethics Review – Self-Assessment Tool (ER-SAT). This tool is approved by our organization and helps to determine whether a full Research Ethics Board (REB) approval is required. The project was assessed by the ER-SAT and an REB was not deemed necessary. Apologies that this was not made clear in the manuscript – we have since edited that section to reflect the above.

**Change in text:** Changes in text: Ethical considerations for this quality improvement project was assessed through the organization’s Ethics Review – Self Assessment Tool and was deemed to not require a full Research Ethics Board review.

P.5 line 122

**Comment 6:** Discussion

**Reply 6:** Thank you we began our discussion with a summary of the key findings. The authors also added additional work from other studies to strengthen the discussion section.

**Changes in the text:** The entire discussion section was reworked to incorporate your feedback and strengthen each point with additional references including Salifu et al 2021 ‘My wife is my doctor at home’..

**Reviewer B:**

**Comment 1:** Is this a project or a study – please clarify

**Response 1:** This is a quality improvement project; thank you for pointing this out. We have corrected the manuscript language to reflect this. Page 1 line 13

**Comment 2:** Reviewing Figures and Tables

Please note there are only: 3 figures, 1 appendix and 1 table now in this version of the paper and they have been clearly outlined.

**Comment 3:** The description of the project context should be its own section with title.

**Response 3:** Thank you for pointing this out, we have formatted the text and inserted a title to better indicate the section that describes our hospital context.

**Change in text 3:** p5, line 115

**Comment 4:** Elaborating the Lean and Six Sigma methodology including reference

**Response 4:** Thank you, the previous reviewer also had this same suggestion. We have elaborated on the methodology and referenced accordingly in the “Improvement Framework” section of the manuscript.

**Change in text:** p.5 line 117; p 5. Line 127, p.8 line 184

**Comment 5:** Please open PDSA acronym and further describe its meaning and relevance to the project/methods.

**Response 5:** Thank you for this, we have included a description of what Plan Do Study Act cycles are as part of the methodology in the “Improvement Framework” section and ensured that the description occurs before using the PDSA acronym in the remainder of the paper.

**Change in text:** p6, line 135

**Comment 6:** Explaining Process Control Boards

**Response 6:** Thank you, we have added a description for process control boards and its relevance to the methods in the “Data Collection and Statistical Analysis” section.

**Change in text:** p. 8, line 182

**Comment 7:** Remove redundant sentence in Results section starting with “Unfortunately...”.

**Response 7:** Thank you – we have removed the sentence starting with “Unfortunately...” at the end of the Results section as it is already discussed in the Limitations section

**Comment 8:** Discussion should start with the main results of this study not with references to the previous studies.

**Response 8:** We have removed the reference from the previous study as the starting line of the discussion section.

**Change in text:** p 8, line 192 the results section starts and has been rewritten

**Comment 9:** Conclusion: Authors could consider if the last sentence of this chapter starting “this study highlights the benefits” is enough for the content of the conclusion

**Response 9:** You are correct we have removed the wording highlighting the benefits and have rewritten the conclusion

**Change in text:** p. 13 line 320

## **REVIEWER C**

**Comment 1:** I was surprised to see: come to the unit to write the discharge order” Page 4 line 92 under local context we describe how our system is a hybrid and still has written discharge orders.

**Comment 2:** In APPENDIX 2: adjusted specific information: Partial name: today’s date and “ 10 am target and some target”

**Response 2:** thank you for your feedback- Partial names have been removed such as “Ms. S” etc and have replaced them with patient 1, 2 et

Today’s date has been changed to “Date of anticipated discharge”

There is now consistency with the red wording **10 AM TARGET ACHIEVED.**

**Change in Text:** Appendix 2 has been redone

**Comment 3:** Multiple Process measures and % of pre-discharge and % pre-discharge summaries were not shared in the results section:

**Response 3:** Thank you for that comment and the results of the multy process measures are now commented on in the paper

**Change in Text:** under the results section starting at p. 9 we describe the process measures results line 209

**Comment 4:** Your discussion did not explain weekend/weekdays may differ

**Response 4:** Thank you for that comment and we have now elaborate on why weekend differs from weekday

**Change in Text:** p. 10 line 230

---