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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your invitation to review the analyses of the manuscript titled "Psychometric properties of the Chinese mainland version of Palliative Care Spiritual Care Competency Scale (PCSCCS-M) in nursing: A Cross-sectional Research Study". This cross-sectional study translated and evaluated the psychometric properties of the PCSCCS-M for use by nurses from mainland China. Overall the analyses of this study are appropriate for the aims but here are some minor comments:

- The authors provide Cronbach's alpha for the two tools they report in the methods section - are these results from the current study sample or were these from previous studies? I am guessing it is from the original study sample but this needs to be stated.

- The translation process appears to be thorough and well conducted

- The authors employed a relatively large sample of nurses (n=356) which as recommended by Mokkink and colleagues (see reference below) is sufficient (7 participants per item and ≥100)

- Good Cronbach alpha statistics for overall scale and subscales

- I would suggest including the labels for the factors in the results section and the relevant tables for ease of understanding

- Table 4 suggests that if you use the criteria set out in the methods section (i.e., factor loadings >.40 although on p.15 line 253, this is .45 - be consistent in the criteria you are using) then there are some double loadings. For example item 5 items have double loadings (items 1, 5, 6, 11, 12) especially items 11 and 12 in factor 3. This needs to be discussed in detail and how these double loadings fared when some items were removed.

- Table 6 suggests that an adjusted 6-factor model excluding item 13 was also evaluated but this is not presented in the results.

- The labelling of Table 6 also suggests that 6-factor model was evaluated but the table presents results for the various 3-factor models
- The authors provide a good description of how they evaluated two problematic items (13 and 14) further however they should consider providing a recommendation as to whether future research/practice should exclude these items.


**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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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