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Associations between successful palliative cancer pathways and community nurse involvement

Dear Editor and referees

We thank you once again for your very useful comments and suggestions to improve our manuscript. We have rewritten the manuscript and have carefully taken all the comments into consideration.

Below are our comments to the referees’ comments. Our comments are written in red.

We look forward hearing from you again.

On behalf of the authors,
Yours Sincerely

Mette Asbjørn Neergaard
Speciality Registrar, PhD
The Palliative Specialist Team
Aarhus University Hospital
Noerrebrogaade, DK-8000 Aarhus C
And
The Research Unit for General Practice
University of Aarhus
Bartholins Alle 2, DK-8000 Aarhus
Phone: +45 8942 6010
Email: man@alm.au.dk
Reviewer 1 & 3:
Both reviewers wrote that we adequately addressed the important review comments.

Reviewer 2 wrote:
The paper reads much better on the whole. There are still a couple of minor alterations should be made in the paper before publication.

What a Palliative care pathway is defined in the analysis section. I think either a reference to this at the bottom of the introduction section or a sentence pointing to where it is defined in the analysis section, would be helpful.

We rewrote the last sentence in the first paragraph of the background section to:
‘This makes it even more important to question home-death as a measure of a successful palliative period at home, i.e. the last period of the patient’s life during which all curative treatment had been discontinued and care and treatment were provided for palliative purposes only.’

What is being done with the rest of the data collected from the questionnaire? Only a fraction of the data were used in this paper. (Page 6 para 2) This should be described briefly either in the discussion section or the analysis section- ie why the whole dataset analysis is not in the one article.

We rewrote the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 6:
‘Only a small part of the data from the questionnaires was used in this study since it is part of a larger research project with present and future publications [13].’ (The reference is to the PhD project that this article is a part of.

“Data” is a plural word. It is frequently referred to in the paper with a singular.

This mistake was corrected throughout the paper (Two sentences).