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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for asking me to review this interesting paper. It is well written and interesting to the palliative care community. Before publication, I would suggest a few minor revisions as listed below.

Background:

Mention something about what cognitive interviewing is and about the value of cognitive interviewing as this is only the first step of validation.

Section about IPOS on page 4 should be moved to page 3, line 59, after the explanation that IPOS is existing in England and in Germany. Aims sit then better as last part before methods section.

Methods:

Page 6: Heading should include term "cognitive interviewing" as this is the main focus of the paper and also mentioned in the title.

Page 6, line 5: the authors talk about the three care contexts but it is not clear what the refer to (actually becomes clear later). When they talk about generalist and specialist palliative care before, that refers only to two contexts.

Professions: any reasons why only nurses were interviewed and doctors not included?

Page 6, line 32: the information given from here onwards (including Table 1) should be moved to the results section.

Page 6, line 56/57. The sentence "The pre-test of IPOS…" should also go to results.

Page 6, cognitive interviews: this para should be moved before "Participants and setting" as the main research design is described here.
Page 7, line 16/17: the information about the duration of the interviews should be moved to the results section.

Discussion:

Page 13, line 41: it should be outcome measure instead of outcome measurement

Page 14: next step would not be implementation but psychometric testing. Is that planned?

Page 14: The German IPOS cognitive interviews were also simultaneously with patients and staff. See Schildman et al Pall Med 2015

Page 16: The paragraph about Ethics approval should be moved to the methods section and be placed at the very end of the methods section.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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