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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review 'Development and validation of a French questionnaire concerning patients' perspectives of the quality of palliative care: the QUALI-PALLI-Patient'. Overall the article provides information that is an important contribution. There are however areas of your article which require further clarification as outlined below:

Abstract - please spell out all acronyms in the abstract (e.g. PCA, MDASI)

Background Line 11 - The organization of care and the skills of caregivers may vary between countries. Please provide references to support statement.

Line 13 reference to support Quali Pali

Methods Lines 12-14. There should be a subheading for ethics rather than starting the ethics section.

Please separate out methods section by design, sample, process etc.

The section is difficult to read as currently structured.

Method Line 9 This questionnaire was presented to 12 patients from three different structures- what do you mean by structures? Do you mean wards/units?

Line 9 page 8 Please provide reference for MDASI

Scoring- why were the items re-scaled? Please provide an explanation.

Acceptability - Please provide some support in the literature for your method of assessing acceptability.
Please provide a better explanation of the PPS score and rationale for use. Is PPS Palliative Performance Scale (PPS)? If so, please spell out and reference.

Content - Please provide the areas of practice for each physician as well as the number of physicians involved.

Reproducibility - Line 1 pg. 2 "A time of one week is generally considered 1 to be appropriate." Please provide a reference to support this statement.

External Validity Lines 12-15 page 12 "However, although 13 symptoms and satisfaction with care are related, they would not be expected to highly correlate, as the aggravation of symptoms may precede the level of satisfaction rather than occurring concurrently. Please change correlate to correlated.

Please provide reference to support the statement.

Results header should be on page 13

Acceptability - please spell out Missing data and Not applicable

Page 14 line 4-6 "However, according to the results of the qualitative study, items 22 (« My pain is taken care of before I bathe or receive treatment if necessary ») and 35 (« I was able to refuse the presence of volunteers ») were retained [19]. Please provide some explanation rather than just reference.

Construct validity - eight factors does not appear to be a parsimonious solution for the PCA. Please see: Yang, Y., & Xia, Y. (2015). On the number of factors to retain in exploratory factor analysis for ordered categorical data. Behaviour research methods, 47 (3), 756-772.

Discussion

Lines 12-15 page 17 "Our results suggest differences and the need to further improve at least five domains; for example, availability of caregivers and serenity differed according to settings; and information quality, pain management, and multidisciplinary intervention differed according to the age of patients. Please explain further with supportive evidence".

Lines 9-12 page 18 - "According to a theoretical model, changes in health status may affect the tolerance of the patient; acting through a dynamic feedback loop, this adaptation
process aims to maintain or improve the perception of the quality of life [34]." Please name the theoretical model.

Lines 15-17 page 18 "More generally, quality of care from the patient's perspective is not an isolated concept, but rather the interaction between the patient's needs and the response of the structure, confronted by both technical and ethical constraints, to meet those needs." Please provide references to support this statement.

Lines 3-4 page 18 "This has been formalized in the COSMIN checklist (www.cosmin.nl/cosmin_checklist.html)." This element should be in the methods section not the discussion.

Line 7-8 reliability, measurement error and responsiveness are important criteria and should not be minimized.

Lines 12-13 page 19 "We guaranteed content validity by building on a qualitative study among patients." You can't guarantee validity.

Please rephrase.

Lines 7-8 page 20 "pre- and post-measurement tool in quality improvement interventions, as recommended in France, with periodic quality of care audits." Please provide reference to support this statement.

Line 1-2 page 21 Why was it important to retain a spirituality item?

Please ground your response in the literature.

Lines 3-4 page 22 please explain why there would be difficulty in separating perceived quality and subjective importance with reference to the literature.

Page 22 please relate discussion of bias to the literature.
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.

Yes

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

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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