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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

thanks for this very useful article on a relatively unexplored topic. I found it very interesting to read and hopefully this research adds to developing a language of spirituality which is in line with more Western oriented thinking about life issues. However, I have some questions which were raised when reading through your article.

Methods:

What does it mean to be ‘well enough' to participate?

The measure used is this study was the provisional version of the SWB. It can be useful to comment on the provisional character of this measure in the discussion section. Was there a need to adapt if after the validation study? And can you elaborate a little bit on the consequences this might have on the results.

With regard to the part ‘tools', it is not clearly described how the two instruments and the models (from van Laarhoven) do relate to each other. Two instruments were completed by patients and two models were used to distinguish categories. Please explain how the instruments and the models were used in combination.

Results:

The majority of the patients who were included in the study had a performance status of 1. Do the authors think that this corresponds with the palliative care population in general. And if not, what does this mean to them?

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

No

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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