

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-22-1261>

Reviewer Comments

Interesting and well presented review paper

Some small points:

Comment 1: line 22 I would suggest using serious illness communication in full – two sets of s bbreviations is confusing

Reply 1: Note: The email that was sent to me included the review version in pdf format. I was not able to edit that, so I opened the word document that I submitted to you back in Fall 2022. I started to track changes and edited as attached. Please note that the lines that you referred to below are different than those in this new revised document, but I addressed each component as below.

The term “ACP/SIC” was previously chosen to describe serious illness conversations that are focused on the future as opposed to “in the moment” medical decision-making conversations. However, you are correct, this is confusing using two sets of abbreviations to create a new abbreviation. Therefore, to refer to SIC focused on the future, I renamed this entity “future-focused SIC.” This was changed in line 26 and throughout the manuscript, when appropriate.

In some cases, ACP/SIC was used to refer the both distinct entities at the same time. Eg, when referring to both ACP and SIC research, rather than using ACP/SIC research, I broke these two abbreviations up into ACP and SIC. Eg. Line 31

Comment 2: line 30 in could be for

Reply 2: Completed, this is line 34 and throughout the manuscript

Comment 3: Line 197 intense WITH multi-agent

Reply 3: Added “with”, this is now line 201

Comment 4: Line 210 Pancreas to pancreatic

Reply 4: Changed pancreas to pancreatic in lines 182, 184, 206

Comment 5: Line 329 then should be When

Reply 5: Changed then to when, line 350