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Dear Christna Chap

We are pleased to submit a revised version of our manuscript entitled: **Cost effectiveness of erlotinib versus chemotherapy for first-line treatment of no small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in fit elderly patients participating in a prospective phase 2 study (GFPC 0504)**

We thank the reviewers for their appreciative and constructive comments. We have carefully taken all the remarks into account, and our answers to the comments are listed below. We also take into account Editors suggestions.

We hope that this revised version will be suitable for publication in the Journal.

Yours faithfully,

Christos CHOUAID, MD, PhD

---
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Reviewer 1

Major comments

1. We agree with the reviewer and as the Monte Carlo simulation demonstrates that the two strategies do not differ statically we state (end of the introduction section and results section) that no meaningful ICER could be calculated due to equivalence between groups

2. We add information about statistical significance in table 2 and 3

3. The proportional hazard model as stated by the reviewer doesn’t affect survival. As it was not the main objective of the study we don’t add it.

Minor comments

1. We add a reference for the first sentence
2. We change the sentence beginning by “Yet the value….
3. We agree with the reviewer, it’s a cost effectiveness analysis
4. We change as suggested the sentence
5. We change also the sentence
6. We delete reference to “the model”
7. We simplify the sentence
8. Sand study is a typo. Sorry we delete
9. At the time of the submission, we were unaware of Cromwell study, we add it
10. As suggested, we change table 3 for a bar graph (figure 1 in the revised manuscript)
11. Sorry for the typo Table 4, we correct these errors
12. We correct figure 1 (figure 2 in the new version)

Reviewer 2

Specific comments

1. We add a reference
2. The reviewer understands perfectly the method. The difference between the two results is because we have also a 3.5% yearly increment from 2004 costs to 2011 costs and a transformation between US$ and euros.
3. We precise TTP2
4. We agree and corrected table 3. We also corrected the cost of EPO (sorry for this typo error)
5. We also corrected table
6. We also take into account the comments on implication of this study (discussion section)

Reviewer 3

Majors concerns

1. We precise the ASCO recommendations for elderly patients
2. Definitively it’s a cost effectiveness study; we corrected the imprecision
3. We add post treatment in table 2

Minors concerns

1. We corrected NSCLC (in place of NSCL)

Editorials concerns

1. We try to improve the “Author’s Contribution section
2. We delete some authors and we listed all the participants in the acknowledgments section. We get the authorization of all authors to do it.
3. We add Trial Registration Number and ethical approval
4. We check reference in accordance with Journal style