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Reviewer's report:

The paper is interesting, well structured and easy to understand.

Some considerations arise from the text:

Line 60
Why Patient in distress have to be excluded? How the distressed status was evaluated? The explanation of patient in distress is actually reported at page 6 line 155 ("unable to maintain a conversation during a period of time"). It is better to anticipate such statement

Line 195
Patient version. There are other versions, for example for caregivers?

Line 202
Why the 11 cut-off threshold of HADS was proposed? In literature other cut-off are presented and discussed in comorbid pathologies

Line 261-263
I think that the following concepts have to be more explained: feeling at peace and share feelings

Line 268-275
The evaluation for anxiety and depression is only concerning the item 3 and 5 of IPOS? Are also data from HADS considered ? Did the Authors a comparison between IPOS and HADS results ?

Line 287
In the dignity approach by Chochinov one of the most relevant worries is to be a burden for the family. Is the IPOS item concerning family anxiety and worry also related to this aspect?

Line 289 and following
Did the Authors considered the relationship between pain and depression? Are Patients free of psychopharmacological and/or psychological interventions?
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 am able to assess the statistics

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