

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-23-20>

Comments	Reply	Changes in the text (additional text highlighted in red)
<b>Reviewer Comments</b>  Indeed, much is known about the types of palliative care transitions, but much less is known about how families are impacted by these transitions. This is a very well written, rigorous study that adds important context to the experience of palliative care transitions of patients and family carers. I only have a few suggestions, mainly for clarification.	We feel very honored with this positive feedback and wish to thank the reviewer!	
First, it isn't clear to me what actual qualitative research method was used. The constant comparative method, in my understanding, is a process that is part of conducting a grounded theory study. Was grounded theory the actual methodological approach? If so, I would expect to see some mention of memoing, hand sorting of the data, and a theoretical model as part of the results.	We thank the reviewer for this comment. We did not use the grounded theory approach for our study. It is indeed absolutely right that constant comparison is one of the characteristics of the grounded theory approach for analyzing qualitative research. However, the constant comparative approach is not restricted to grounded theory but can also be used outside of grounded theory, as described by Fram and Hewitt-Taylor (1, 2).	

<p>Using the COREQ the authors do not describe the coding tree or participant checking so additional details about the actual method used would be helpful.</p> <p>Second, although additional recruitment was scheduled if data saturation was not reached, I can only assume that saturation was achieved since it isn't explicitly stated. Given that the authors can not account for the number or potential participants who were approached for this study, additional information would help clarify things</p>	<p>We thank the reviewer for his/her attentiveness. The description of the coding tree is reported on page 10 of the manuscript, but was unfortunately not registered in the COREQ checklist. The COREQ checklist has been adjusted accordingly. Participants have not been asked to provide feedback on the findings, for reasons of feasibility. We adjusted the COREQ checklist and added N/A in section 28 (participant checking), for the sake of completeness.</p> <p>In the strengths and limitations section of the manuscript (p30), we indeed described that we do not know the total number of family carers that has been approached for participation in the study or the number of persons that did not show interest in it. We realize accordingly that we need to be careful to assume that we have achieved saturation. We therefore adjusted the manuscript and wish to thank the reviewer for this right remark.</p>	<p>P8 (170-173): Attention was paid to recruiting family carers from each of the different care settings providing palliative care, to capture as broad a range of experiences as possible. <i>Data collection process</i></p>
--	---	--

1. Fram SMJTqr. The constant comparative analysis method outside of grounded theory. 2013;18(1):1-25.
2. Hewitt-Taylor J. Use of constant comparative analysis in qualitative research. Nurs Stand. 2001;15(42):39-42.