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Editors/reviewers comments

Authors response

Changes made

Editor’s Comments

1) Please include a conclusion section.

A conclusion section has been added

Discussion section, lines 3-7, page 10

2) Please include a list of abbreviations after the conclusion section.
A list of abbreviations has been added

After Conclusions,

lines 8-13, page 10

3) Please change the heading “Consent to publish” to “Consent for publication”.

Has been changed

Declarations section

Page 10

4) In accordance with our Submission Guidelines (https://bmcpalliatcare.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript#preparing+tables), please do not include colour or shading in Tables.

We have revised Table 2 and removed all shading

See Revised Table 2

5) Please change Table 3 to Figure 1.

We have relabelled Table 3 as Figure 1

See Figure 1

6) Please include a statement in the competing interests section that Nancy Preston and Sean Hughes are members of the Editorial Board of BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.

We assume that this is a typographical error in respect of the journal title. We have added the following text.

Competing Interests section, line 4, page 11

Nancy Preston and Sean Hughes are members of the Editorial Board of BMC Palliative Care.

Reviewer 1 Christoph Ostgathe
The table with the recommendations is hard to read; I would like to see either the table 2 sorted along the ranking or even better three - sorted - tables (one seperated for Macro, Meso and Micro Levels, respectively).

We have revised Table 2 which now presents items by rank order

See Revised Table 2

Reviewer 2 Marilène Filbet

1- if the goal of the study is to establish valid recommendations the methodology seems should have been stronger as a Delphi methodology, for validated results

We have acknowledged this point in the ‘Strengths and Limitations’ section although we followed MORECare guidelines using the TEC methodology.


The TEC methods were appropriate and feasible, but Delphi methodology may have been stronger.

2- if the goal of the study is to establish international recommendations the expert panel is mostly european and limit the results generalization

We have acknowledged this point in the ‘Strengths and Limitations’ section

Strengths and Limitations section, line 25, page 9.
‘predominantly European’

3- there is few clinicians in the panel

We have acknowledged this point in the ‘Strengths and Limitations’ section

Strengths and Limitations section, lines 28-29 and 30-31, page 9.
‘and a forthcoming paper will explore the views of clinicians.’

‘Further research is required that explores perspectives of others including clinicians’

4- the table 2 are not easy to read and confusing about the ranking. I would suggest to present the results from the first to the last recommendations
We have revised Table 2 which now presents items by rank order. See revised Table 2.