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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes the cultural adaptation of the staff and patient versions of the Integrated Palliative Care Outcome Scale (IPOS) in a Swedish context.

Although this paper deals with one particular questionnaire in one particular cultural setting, the findings are relevant to a broader audience as the study sheds light on the nuances in perception of questionnaire items in this and related fields. The findings and reflections presented in this paper will inform the interpretation of responses to questionnaires in the field of palliation more broadly. Also, the paper presents a 'template' for how to choose and culturally validate existing questionnaires in across languages and cultures. In my opinion, this paper therefore has high scientific importance.

In addition, the paper is of high quality. The methods used are sound and the paper is well disposed and written.

I have only a few minor comments:

Method, p. 7, line 5-7: 'The interviews were carried out in three round'. Please specify the number of interviews in each round (this is only briefly addressed in the Discussion).

Discussion p. 13, line 34: 'investment of completing IPOS'. Maybe you could specify the investment, e.g., 'investment of time and energy in completing the IPOS'.

Discussion p 14, line 59: Is it possible to find a more specific word or description than 'polishing' in 'improving and polishing the Swedish-language IPOS’?

Table 2, Drowsiness, Patients' comprehension: 'One patient did not understood what drowsiness was' should be replaced by 'One patient did not understand what drowsiness was'.

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.

Yes

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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