

Peer Review

Review of: "Palliative Care, Psychological Interventions, Personalized Medicine: The Triple "P" Hypothesis For Enhancing Quality of Life in Palliative Care"

Christina Karamanidou¹

1. The Centre for Research and Technology, Hellas, Thessaloniki, Greece

Dear Authors,

I had the opportunity to read and review your article, and I commend you for tackling such an important and timely topic—redefining palliative care through the integration of psychological interventions and personalized medicine. With respect to your work, here are some comments:

Introduction to re-definition of Palliative Care

The introduction provides a good foundation for the article, highlighting the importance of integrating psychological interventions and personalized medicine into palliative care. However, the following clarifications are necessary:

1st §: Consider explaining the specific challenges or gaps that currently exist in palliative care, particularly with respect to psychological support and personalized medicine. A clearer statement of the need for redefinition would strengthen and better anchor the argument.

1st §: "The infusion of palliative care ... patients": Include a citation supporting the statement that palliative care has revolutionized care quality through holistic well-being.

3rd §: "...psychological interventions contribute to more positive care outcomes...improving their overall quality of life": Strengthen this claim by briefly citing specific studies or examples.

5th §: "Despite the ... these interventions": Why are psychological interventions underutilized despite evidence of their effectiveness? For example, are there systemic barriers, resource limitations, or a

lack of training in palliative care teams? Expand on the reasons behind this deprivation.

5th §: “In this way...not”: The sentence is complex, and the way the ideas are connected needs improvement. Shorter, clearer sentences would enhance readability and coherence.

7th §: “The psychological approach... late effective”: The sentence is overly complex, and the argument it presents is unclear.

Personalization and tailoring interventions in a palliative care setting

This section introduces personalized approaches but jumps quickly between different aspects (RDoC, genetic counseling, pain subtypes, EEG data) without fully connecting them. It may be helpful to more explicitly tie these elements to the Triple “P” model introduced earlier and clarify how they integrate into psychological care in palliative settings.

9th §: “According to the main ... palliative care setting”: How might personalized approaches improve psychological interventions in palliative care? Are there studies or models that directly apply RDoC to palliative care? Citing studies specifically focused on the integration of RDoC in palliative care would add depth to this.

9th §: “For example, genetic counseling...”: The transitions between subsections (e.g., genetic counseling, pain studies) need smoother flow. Use bridging sentences to connect these ideas back to personalized palliative care.

Triple “P” approach

15th §: “The Triple “P”...Personalized Medicine”: Consider elaborating on how this integration practically manifests in clinical settings to make the explanation more actionable. Consider briefly defining each component of the Triple 'P' Model to make this sentence more accessible.

16th §: “An important limitation ... in palliative care”: You could specify examples or data to highlight how this limitation impacts patient outcomes to strengthen the argument. Clarifying this point would help reinforce the model's practical feasibility.

General comment:

The article presents a promising exploration of integrating palliative care, psychological interventions, and personalized medicine, highlighting a much-needed shift toward holistic and individualized care. However, several areas require major revision. The article could benefit from more clarity and consistency in defining key terms, particularly in the section on the Triple "P" model,

where some aspects of the framework are introduced but not fully elaborated. Expanding on these points would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the model's potential value and application. Personally, I find it unclear what new insights or perspectives this model offers and how it can be practically implemented in real-world settings. Lastly, a more structured flow, with clearer transitions between the sections, would enhance readability and cohesion.

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.