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Reviewer’s report:

Dear author team, thank you very much for this opportunity to review your manuscript on the translation and validation of an Italian version of the the Cancer Behavior Inventory within the Palliative Care setting. Please find my comments below. I hope you find them constructive and helpful in providing an amended version of your interesting study.

BACKGROUND

- page 4, Line 14: This is probably due to translation issues, but your sentence on treatment is problematic and will be perceived as challenging by many Palliative Care specialists. Treatment refers to every medical or psychosocial intervention during a patient trajectory and not just to anti-neoplastic interventions; however, if I read your sentence correctly, this is what you are referring to. Please re-phrase the sentence and make explicit what you mean by 'treatment'.

- page 4, Line 17: Please be careful when using the term 'Palliative patient' or 'supportive patient'; this might be misinterpreted by some readers. If I read your sentence correctly, then you are referring to patients receiving palliative or supportive care interventions. Please do not use 'palliative' or 'supportive' as adjectives in this context.

- page 4, Line 21: Which 'added challenges' are you referring to. Please be explicit and state references if you can. I might suggest the following three sources for a start, but please see those as suggestions only:


http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0957926514564739


- page 5: I really like how you are introducing the self-efficacy model and research! Thank you.
- page 6, line 4: Your description of aims for this study in inconsistent with your study title. Your title suggest that you are reporting on the translation process as well for which I can unfortunately not find any details throughout the manuscript. Please align your title and introduction section. I would highly recommend to consider reporting on your translation process and quality assurance techniques as this will be of interest to the reader and will help in understanding what you actually did apart from the statistical analyses.

METHODS:

- See my earlier comment: When starting to read your manuscript, the reader anticipates a detailed description of the bi-lingual translation process; however, this is absent from the methods section. Please discuss and revise or change the title of your submission.

RESULTS:

- Please report on the uptake of your study, drop-outs etc. Please consider referring to the STROBE reporting guidelines to standardise your reporting for those variables.

DISCUSSION:

- page 13, line 4: see my comments above. Your description of aim is not consistent with the title. You would be able to make a very strong argument for your translated measure if the translation process was more transparent. For an example, you could say something along the lines of "CBI-B was translated following the proposed guidelines for cultural adaption by Guillemin et al. (Guillemin et al., 1993). An overview of the translation process is shown in Figure 1. In order to study the health care needs of people with diverse cultural backgrounds, research instruments must be reliable and valid in each culture studied. (Gjersing, 2010; Munet-Vilaró F., 1990). If quantitative measures are used in research, it is necessary to translate these measures into the language of culture being studied. Without verification of translation adequacy, differences found while using the target language version in the target population, might be due to errors in translation, rather than being true differences between countries (Maneesriwongul & Dixon, 2004)." Again, please see this wording as a suggestion only.


- page 15, line 1-6: I agree with your important description of limitations. In light of those, I would urge you to reconsider your discussion above and tone down the conclusions you draw from your study, which was intended to provide evidence of a successful translation and validation process. Please focus a bit more on these aspects in your discussion so that the reader has a more rounded impression of your manuscript. For an example, what problems did you encounter during your translation process? Did you encounter any difficulties with change of meaning of words after translation etc?

I hope my comments will be helpful in further developing your manuscript. Please see them as constructive feedback with the intention to help you improve your already well written manuscript even further.
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