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Reviewer's report:

STATISTICAL REVIEWER ASSESSMENT:

Is the study design appropriate for the research question (considering whether the analyzed population accurately reflects the design and whether you see any problems with control/comparison groups, e.g., likely confounders)?
No - there are minor issues

Are methodologies adequate and well implemented (considering whether assumptions are addressed and whether analyses are robust)?
Yes - methodologies are adequate and well implemented, assumptions are addressed, analysis is robust

Are the analyses adequately communicated (considering whether reporting details are adequate and whether figures and tables are well labeled and described)?
Yes - important reporting details are present, analyses are adequately communicated, figures and tables are well labeled and described

Does the interpretation accurately reflect the analyses without overstatement (considering whether limitations/bias are acknowledged and whether accurate descriptors, e.g., 'significant', are used)?
Yes - interpretation accurately reflects analyses, limitations/bias are acknowledged, accurate descriptors are used

Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a statistically sound contribution?
Probably - with minor revisions

STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS:

A useful review of the literature at the start

The study has the equivalent of ethics committee approval.

An interesting and important study
Tables 1 to 6 are detailed and informative

Method - If the study is to be representative of Taiwan why is just one hospital surveyed?

Why is surgery excluded? Are there not a lot of cancer cases I surgical patients?

The cronbach alpha scores are given for 6 items used of the original 31 item Zhou study - can such a comparison be made as the whole question Zhou told is not used?

The ACP-K does not state what an acceptable score but states 0.42 is acceptable

Where did the ACP-A score originate from?

It needs to be stated why Cronbach alpha was the statistical measure chosen over other potential statistical methods

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
Previous issues in earlier section and how has a 98.2% response rate obtained? This seems amazingly high.
IHAC has some high p values- I assume this means that they are not statistically significant

Page 7 - "this model generate" - what does this mean?

The reasons for using Pearson's correlation coefficient should be stated and similarly Regression analyses

The limitations at the end state that it is a small study in one centre and no generalisable conclusions can be made, so perhaps descriptive statistics eg mean, median etc would be enough without the need for these complex analyses. This is how the conclusion is written. I am assuming no generalisations can be made beyond this hospital in Taiwan and so not for Taiwan itself or wider still globally.

All the statistics refer to Zhou's study (reference 21) and perhaps are description of this given and the pros and cons of using this as a validated tool or otherwise

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
As detailed earlier
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.

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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