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**Reviewer's report:**

This study protocol addresses important questions extremely relevant for the literature and could contribute with new knowledge regarding measuring patient's outcomes in palliative care practice.

However, there are some issues that could be addressed in order to make this paper more robust. I hope the authors find these comments useful.

Stated aims throughout the text: the title mentions "evaluating the feasibility, acceptability and potential effectiveness", however, the aim in the abstract only mentions "modeling and testing the feasibility". Then in the body text, under the heading "Aim", in page 5, it reads "The aim of the present study is to improve the QoL of patients newly admitted to a hospice inpatient unit". This is a bit confusing from the reader's point of view and it is only in page 6, where the primary and secondary objectives are stated that the aims of this study protocol become completely clear. Therefore, I would suggest the authors to review these aims and objectives' statements throughout the text and make them more coherent.

**Key words:** I would suggest to add "Patient centered outcome measure"

**Methods and design (page 5):** I would suggest to make it clearer in the text that the flow chart in Figure 1 pertains to the entire project and not just the feasibility study described in the paper, INFO-QoL. When I read the text as is and then look for Figure 1, I was expecting to see the information given in Table 2.

**Study Population (page 7) - bottom of page:** I would add one or more references for the Liverpool Care Pathway and would make clear if it is still used in Italy, given the past events in the UK regarding this tool.
Modeling phase (page 8): I would suggest to reference the structure-process-outcome model of quality of care where it reads "The Nursing Role Effectiveness Model [17] was used to guide the development of the questionnaire. The model is based on the structure-process-outcome model of quality of care."

Discussion: I understand this is a protocol paper and therefore the discussion section is never long, but as is, it seems more like a list of bullet points and not "discussion" text. I would suggest the authors to rethink the discussion text taking into consideration that they can (and should) use published literature to help discuss and compare the statements present in the "bullet points". Improving the discussion section would add to the overall quality of this well written paper.
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