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Reviewer’s report:

Whilst the subject is of great interest, and it is welcome to read the views on clinical trials from Non-Western Nationalities, the manuscript is rather repetitive and should be edited to make it more succinct.

Major compulsory revisions

Abstract
The methods section needs elaboration. For example, is the clinical trial hypothetical?, a VAS scale was used (this is not mentioned until the conclusion). What does well trained research nurse mean? The word higher is repeated too many times in the results section. In the conclusion the authors state “our data would help researchers conduct clinical trials successfully in Asia” – How?

Introduction
The introduction needs to be rewritten to contain more facts – for example- how many clinical trials are conducted in Korea – what proportion of patients are recruited to trials – how does this compare with the 5% that the authors note in the USA? How does the doctor – patient relationships differ in Asia compared with Western World?

Materials and methods
There is some repetition in this section. Break it down into e.g., participants/recruitment/questionnaire details. The questions from the questionnaire can be as an appendix rather than in the text with a VAS scale, but the questionnaire can be described.

Was it all self-completed by the patient?- How many questions in total – 21 or 21 plus the others? Was a VAS scale used for them all or only the ones shown. It is unclear.

Results
Again this is so repetitive – see the start of patient cohort –“ From July 1st 2011 etc.”

The word most is repeated throughout.
The results section needs to be made more succinct., we already know you used a VAS scale so there is no need to keep saying that.
Discussion

Some repetition is found here from the introduction.

On page 17 you say that “…while a higher degree of education, being married, and high economic status were associated with a higher degree of awareness of clinical trials, these variables were not associated with the actual participation in clinical trials.”

The word “actual participation is misleading” because the patients were not being recruited to an actual trial.

Conclusion

Can the authors suggest how understanding cancer patients’ perception etc would facilitate conducting clinical trials in Asia?

Minor compulsory revisions

The title has the phrase “unique characteristics of Korean cancer patients” but I think this is misleading as there was not anything “unique” in their characteristics compared with similar publications from other nationalities.

Scattered throughout the manuscript are translation errors e.g. “As the matter of fact……”, this should be “As a matter of fact….,” (top page 6), and “In the scale of 10” , this should be “On a Scale of 0 to 10” (Page 12, page 13). There are other similar errors.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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