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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor-In-Chief, Dear Reviewer,

We would like to thank you for reviewing our paper PCAR-D-18-00057R2 entitled "Music in palliative care: a qualitative study with patients suffering from cancer".

We think the reviewer’s comment have greatly improved the manuscript, which we hope will soon be ready for publication.

We highlighted our responses to the reviewers’ comments in the revised version of the manuscript by using the “track changes” mode.

Thank you in advance for considering our work.

Sincerely yours,

Stephane Sanchez, MD, MSc, MPH,
Hôpitaux Champagne Sud - Pôle Information Médicale Evaluation Performance,
Reviewers' Comments to Author

Isaac Chua (Reviewer 3):

1) The manuscript has improved significantly since the original version that was submitted. It is clearer to read and much easier to follow.

We would like to thank the reviewer for this comment.

2) However, the discussion section still fails to distinguish its results from earlier studies about music therapy in the palliative care setting. It also fails to tie together the different themes that were identified in any meaningful or insightful way. Simply adding a comment in the conclusion to underline the main finding of this study that music therapy is a "living art form that humanizes care" does not suffice.

Upon reviewing the literature, we realized that the themes found in other studies tended to concentrate on positive aspects of music therapy whereas our study contains quotes from patients for whom music induced negative thoughts like references to loss of autonomy, fatigue etc. We added sentences at the beginning of the Discussion (line 30, page 11), in the Conclusions section (line 36, page 14) and in the Abstract to emphasize this as a novel finding. Moreover, we added new References to contrast our findings with the existing literature:


3) I would recommend that you re-analyze your data and really think through what makes your findings unique.

In addition to the previously mentioned modifications, we deleted parts of the discussion which could make the article difficult to read. The main lines of the article should appear more clearly in the revised manuscript.