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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for the opportunity to review your revised manuscript. You have provided further clarifications, however there are still some concerns with the manuscript as outlined below:

abstract - please specify how many items were removed

Cronbach's α, was very good or acceptable for all subscales, except the 1 last one. Please state the actual values.

Stability - Do you mean test retest reliability?

How is Palliative Performance Scale (PPS) a subgroup?

Introduction

Line 4-5 "Many tools with varying content and of varying clinimetric conditions 5 of use focus mainly on physical functioning or psychological symptoms [1]" Please provide more than one reference.

Line 9 "[11,12]." remove full stop

Lines 8-9 please provide examples of the domains previously explored

Line 12 - The organization of care and the skills of caregivers vary between countries [19]. Please provide further clarification

Line 19 - on what basis do you assert that your method is well-grounded?

Line 9 page 5 It had to be usable in all structures where palliative patients are hospitalized. Please reword. What do you mean by structures? Why only for hospitalised patients? Why not other settings?
Methods

Please provide a rationale for rescaling to 1-4

Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) are both variable reduction techniques and sometimes mistaken as the same statistical method. However, there are distinct differences between PCA and EFA.

PCA
Is a variable reduction technique
Is used when variables are highly correlated
Reduces the number of observed variables to smaller number of principal components
Large sample procedure

EFA
Is a variable reduction technique which identifies the number of latent constructs and the underlying factor structure of a set of variables
Hypothesizes an underlying construct, a variable not measured directly
Estimates factors which influence responses on observed variables
Allows you to describe and identify the number of latent constructs (factors)
Includes unique factors, error due to unreliability in measurement

Traditionally has been used to explore the possible underlying factor structure of a set of measured variables without imposing any preconceived structure on the outcome (Child, 1990).

Line 21 page 10 is Cattell's scree plot not Cattle's

Page 11 "then, at last, clinical judgment was used" Please explain the criteria on which clinical judgement was based.

Line 17 choose medicine or physicians not both

Line 17 page 12 What do you mean by high correlation?

Please specify what you mean by good acceptability? Please provide numbers of what constitutes acceptable.
Discussion
Stability - you can't claim stability without presenting the data to support that statement.

Lines 19-20 page 17 "Satisfaction with care and quality of care are not exchangeable measures [39]" Do you mean interchangeable?

Lines 1-15 page 18 sounds more like a recommendation than a discussion of results.

Page 20 lines 12-13 please cite reference appropriately

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.

No

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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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