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Dear authors

Thank you very much for benevolent revision of the manuscript and for your additional thoughts. I agree with all implementations.

In my opinion, there remain only the point, if the conceptual foundation of the scale is a formative or a reflective measurement model. In relation to Hamric and Epstein you wrote this point is quite confusing.

In my opinion, they state unequivocally, that the moral distress-triggering situations, determined in the context of corresponding qualitative studies, represent the manifest, defining indicators for the disturbance of moral distress, the strength of which is recorded using the response scale.

Hence (Hamric, Borchers, & Epstein, 2012) write on page 4: "Using this scoring scheme allows all items marked as never experienced or not distressing to be eliminated from the composite score, giving a more accurate reflection of actual moral distress."

Or (Epstein, Whitehead, Prompahakul, Thacker, & Hamric, 2019) write on page 113: "An exploratory factor analysis revealed a four-factor structure, reflective of patient, unit, and system levels of moral distress.". In addition, on page 116: "Finally, we hypothesized that the MMD-HP would have a three-level structure (patient, team, and system), reflective of the levels of moral distress identified from moral distress consultation"

These formulations seem to me to speak clearly for a reflective measurement model, in which the roots or causes are the indicators with which the expression of the latent variable disturbance of moral distress is recorded.

Well, it may be this discussion is beyond the scope of such a review. The decision as to which measurement model is to be used as the basis for a questionnaire is one that is made at the beginning of the development of an instrument, because the entire questionnaire development and the procedure for data analysis are based on it. In this respect, it now may be inappropriate to want to subsequently decide about the underlying measurement model. In my opinion, it was definitely worth discussing this.

Reviewer conclusion

I recommend publishing this important and interesting work at this point. It was a pleasure to me reviewing this very interesting manuscript.
I wish the authors all the best for the further work with the Swedish paediatric MDS-R.
With kind regards.
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