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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting article, with relevance in its field. The questions posed by the authors are well defined and the methods are appropriate and well described too. Nevertheless, some minor revisions could be made in order to improve its quality.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. P.6 vs P.7 – In page 6, the author explicit who were the researcher in charge of selecting the studies, who were the researchers who screened the full texts more thoroughly, and with whom the disagreements were discussed. Although the authors did this explicitly in this section of the article, they did not do in the section about “quality assessment” (page 7). So, in order to maintain the coherency of the article, if the authors decide to mention “who did what” in one of the sections, it would be more coherent if they mention it in the other section as well (or the other way around i.e. not mentioning “who did what” in none of the sections, since this information can be added in the end of the article and not into it).

2. Page 9 – Identification of studies – A flow diagram of the selection process of the articles would be useful.

3. Page 10 – “Many studies reported survival to discharge…” – What is the meaning of “many”? This term introduces subjectivity; it would be relevant to provide the number of studies that reported this aspect.

4. Page 11 – “Of the included studies, few assessed the quality of life…” – As mentioned previously, it would be relevant to know in how many studies quality of life was assessed, moreover if we consider that this was one of the aims of the article.

5. Page 13 – “The retrieved studies indicated that the quality of life of survivors was acceptable; (…)” – What is an “acceptable” quality of life?

6. Although the authors refer briefly to some limitations (page13), they could have mentioned to the limitations explicitly. Also, based on these limitations and on the results, the authors could have pointed out some keys for further studies.

7. Page 14 – Do these conclusions really refer to the systematic review that has been conducted and answer to the research question and aims of the article? Some of the conclusions are beyond the results and discussion presented by the authors, appearing to be a statement that the authors would like to provide, more...
than to what they can really conclude from the research that they have conducted…

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.