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**Reviewer's report:**

When assessing the work, please consider the following points:

- **Discretionary Revisions** (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore):

  o Would be interesting to note how many patients were newly diagnosed / experiencing advanced cancer, as these categories were alluded to in discussion.

  o Under Factor 1: paragraph 3, it would be good to note if quotes came from health professionals or patients / partners, as reviewer was attempting to unsuccessfully deduce this from the data- and this would add to question re ‘mismatched’ perspectives.

  o As the authors are recognised for introducing the term ‘renegotiated’ sexual and intimate experiences, it would add value to refer to previous author definitions of renegotiated sexuality and intimacy.

- **Minor Essential Revisions** (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct):

  o Varimax rotation and centroid method requires further definition.

  o Figure 1 grid was missing under heading – looks like it was located after tables.

- **Discussion, paragraph 1:** minor revision of wording to enhance readability:

  Consideration of the endorsements of factor arrays within each factor and the sociodemographic...

- **Major Compulsory Revisions** (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) **NIL**

**Level of interest:** An article of outstanding merit and interest 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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