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Dear editor,

Please find attached the revised manuscript entitled: Decision-making capacity and communication about care of older people during the last three months of life [Previous manuscript MS 7808365337836875]. Thank you for considering this manuscript for publication in BMC Palliative Care and the opportunity to revise our manuscript. Please find attached a detailed description of how we have responded to the comments of the referees and the editor. We think that the minor revisions have improved the manuscript substantially.

Yours faithfully,
Also on behalf of the co-authors,
Pam Kaspers

---

**Reaction on the comments of the referees Jane Seymour and Sophie Pautex:**

Referees: ‘The reviewers are happy with the changes made and the manuscript is acceptable for publication with some minor revisions for language and grammar as follows (please see below).’

We would like to thank the reviewers Jane Seymour and Sophie Pautex and the editor Gunn Grande for their time and feedback, and we rephrased the minor revisions for language and grammar (please see below).

**Reaction on the editorial comments by Gunn Grande:**

Editor: ‘The reviewers are happy with the changes made and the manuscript is acceptable for publication with some minor revisions for language and grammar as follows:’

‘Page 2 Results, line 2: ‘in accordance with’ rather ‘in accordance to’

Results last line and elsewhere: normally it is ‘satisfaction with’ rather than ‘satisfaction about’.’

As suggested by the editor, we rephrased the text into ‘in satisfaction with’ (rather than ‘satisfaction about’) and we replaced this phrase throughout the whole manuscript.

Editor: ‘Page 4: To correspond more with convention, insert ‘decision making capacity’ in front of ‘(DMC)’ in line 3 and delete ‘decision making capacity’ in front of ‘(DMC)’ in line 6.

Line 8: ‘divided into five’ rather than ‘divided in five’.’

Editor: ‘Page 6: Line 5: ‘age 57 years and over’ rather than ‘aged 57 and up’

Line 12: ‘The samples included’ rather than ‘The samples enclosed’.’

Editor: ‘Paragraph 2, line 4: ‘to’ rather than ‘tot’.’

Done.

Editor: ‘Page 7: Paragraph 2, lines 3-7: this is a list of four items rather than four complete sentences and should probably rather be listed as four bullet points or four items separated with semicolons.

We rephrased the minor revisions as suggested by the editor and listed the four items as four items separated with semicolons (page 7, paragraph 2, lines 3-7).
Page 7, paragraph 2, line 2-7

‘The NVVE provides four types of standard Ads: 1. a refusal-of-treatment document (ROTD) states in what situations a person does not want to receive life-prolonging treatment; 2. a do-not-resuscitate order (DNR); 3. a document in which somebody can appoint a health care proxy (proxy AD); and 4 an advance euthanasia directive (AED) in which a person can state in which situations he or she would wish life to be ended.’

Five lines from bottom: delete ‘)’ from end of sentence.’
Editor ‘Page 11: Paragraph 3, line 2: ‘only with’ rather than ‘only to’
Last paragraph, heading: ‘ADs’ rather than ‘AD(s)’
Last paragraph, line 1: ‘with and AD’ rather than ‘an AD’.

Done.

Editor: ‘Page 11: Line 2: Delete content within parenthesis as this is simply a repetition of what was said in the preceding sentence Paragraph 2, heading: ‘satisfaction with’ rather than ‘satisfaction on’

As suggested by the editor, we deleted the content within the parenthesis (page 11, line 2).

Page 11, line 2-3
‘People with full DMC mostly died in their own home: in 45% of cases compared to 26% of people with limited DMC dying at home.’

Editor: ‘Page 13: Line 7: ‘in accordance with’ rather than ‘in accordance to’
Paragraph 2, line 3: ‘insight into’ rather than ‘insight in’
Page 14, line 3: ‘died’ rather than ‘deceased’
Page 15, line 6: ‘themselves, and’ rather than ‘themselves. And’
Page 16, paragraph 2: ‘It is remarkable that’ rather than ‘Remarkable is that’
Table 2: ‘Physician communicated understandably’ or ‘Physician communication understandable’ rather than ‘Physician communicated understandable’.

We rephrased the minor revisions, as suggested by the editor.

Editor: ‘Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style (http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/ifora/medicine_journals). It is important that your files are correctly formatted.’

Done.