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Reviewer's report

Title: Patient Self-Appraisal of Change and Minimal Clinically Important Difference on the EORTC QLQ-C30 Before and During Cancer Therapy

Version: 3 Date: 5 February 2013

Reviewer: Kim Cocks

Reviewer's report:
I thank the authors for addressing my previous comments and addressing the shortfalls of the SSQ anchor-based methodology. The message is now more relevant and has been put in context of more recent literature.

Compulsory major revisions
1) On page 15 the authors state “However, compared with the recent guidelines by Cocks et al.13, the range of MCID is more in line with the thresholds for “small” changes.” The definition of small for our study was “Small was used to indicate a subtle but nevertheless clinically relevant change.” Therefore I would conclude that these two studies are in agreement regarding the MCID and this statement should be altered accordingly.

Authors’ Response: We agree with the reviewer that these two studies are in agreement, as the definition of the MCID (minimal clinical important difference) is the same as that for “small” changes (subtle but nevertheless clinically relevant changes) by Cocks et al. We have revised the discussion to conclude the agreement.

Minor essential revisions
1) ‘Osobo’ should be ‘Osoba’
2) Page 10 spelling error ‘participanets’

Authors’ Response: We thank the reviewer for the careful review, and apologize for the errors. We have corrected the spelling/grammar errors.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests
Reviewer's report

Title: Patient Self-Appraisal of Change and Minimal Clinically Important Difference on the EORTC QLQ-C30 Before and During Cancer Therapy

Version: 3 Date: 29 January 2013

Reviewer: Andreas Dinkel

Reviewer's report:
The authors adequately responded to the comments.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.