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Author's response to reviews: see over
RE: Resubmission of our manuscript entitled “Quality-of-life evaluation for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a comparison between vinorelbine plus gemcitabine followed by docetaxel versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin regimens in a randomized trial: Japan Multinational Trial Organization LC00-03 (BRI LC03-01)”.

Dear Editor of BMC Cancer

Thank you for reviewing our manuscript “Quality-of-life evaluation for advanced non-small-cell lung cancer: a comparison between vinorelbine plus gemcitabine followed by docetaxel versus paclitaxel plus carboplatin regimens in a randomized trial: Japan Multinational Trial Organization LC00-03 (BRI LC03-01)” (MS: 1114274519428562). As suggested, I am here by sending a revised manuscript that has been altered in response to your comments.

I wish to thank you for your feedback, which I believe has helped to improve our paper. The manuscript has been rechecked by the authors.

I appreciate the opportunity to resubmit our paper, and I hope that you will now find our paper acceptable for publication.

Sincerely yours

Masaaki Kawahara
Otemae Hospital, 1-5-3 Otemae, Chuo-ku, Osaka, 540-0008, JAPAN
Tel: +81-6-6941-0484, Fax: +81-6-6942-2848,
E-mail: kawaharam@otemae.gr.jp
Specific changes made in response to comments by each reviewer are described below.
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**Reviewer's report:**

OVERALL REVIEW

Ideally this data should have been published in the original JCO article of several years ago. The authors, however, provide a convincing narrative of why that did not happen. Overall, these authors provide a case study of the value of Patient Provided Outcomes for clinical trials.

In this clinical trial no survival benefit was found, these authors however found that one treatment arm had a significant benefit in Quality of Life. The report that a specialist tool the FACT-taxane demonstrated that one arm of the trial should a statistically and clinically significant decline in quality of life. In addition the FACT-G instrument reported a large decline in the patient’s capacity to fulfill activities of normal life.

Quality of written English

This is a very short manuscript that is readable. However, I would make two minor modifications

In the discussion section of the manuscript I would make two minor revisions in the language

1. Replace the sentence “However, the VGD group showed almost a level-off regardless of the time passage….” With something like “Patients in the VGD arm showed no significant variation over time in their quality of life scores, while the patients in the PC arm showed a steady decline in FACT-G and FACT-Taxane scores over time.”

   **Response:** As the reviewer notes, we corrected a sentence to ‘Patients in the VGD arm showed no significant mean variation over time in their QOL scores, while the patients in the PC arm showed a steady decline in FACT-G and FACT-Taxane scores over time.’ in the Discussion section (lines 25 on page 9 to lines 1-3 on page 10).

2. Elemenate the last paragraph in the discussion and replace the first sentence in the next to last paragraph in the discussion with something like” This was a well designed and executed randomized clinical trial, but the Quality of Life portion of the trial had these limitations.”

   **Response:** As the reviewer notes, we corrected a sentence to ‘This was a well designed and executed randomized clinical trial, but the Quality of Life portion of
the trial had these limitations.’ in the Discussion section (lines 5-7 on page 11).