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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed all the revisions as detailed below.

From authors to reviewers:

Before replying each comment form reviewer Dr. Christine McPherson, we do appreciate to you to point out variable comments. We tried to reply reviewer’s comments point by point ;so that we can present that every comment by the reviewer was never ignored. We carefully interpreted them and turned them to advantage for the article improvement.

Responses to the comments by Reviewer Dr. Christine McPherson

Psychological process from hospitalization to death among uninformed terminal liver cancer patients in Japan

Version: Date: 5 27 July 2006

Reviewer: Christine McPherson

Reviewer's report:

General

The article has undergone major revision, as detailed by the corresponding author. As a consequence, rather than a review of the suggested revisions in my two previous reviews, the paper as a whole has been thoroughly reviewed.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Introduction

1. The four types of awareness identified by Glaser and Strauss and the Japanese study by Kashiwagi needs to be explained, since they contribute to understanding the current study and the authorsâ€™ suggest that their study is â€œmore verifiableâ€?. It is difficult to gauge this from the information given.

We added an explanation in the 3rd to 4th line and 7th to 10th line in the 3rd paragraph of a revised manuscript.

Methods and analysis

2. The authors stated that they used grounded theory and later make reference to content analyses in the second sentence last paragraph of the analysis section, in the first sentence of the section entitled â€œModel development of the psychological processâ€?, and again in the last sentence of the first paragraph of the discussion section.

General

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

What next?: Accept without revision
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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