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Cover letter following reviewers comments for the manuscript entitled: “Characteristics and quality of life of patients presenting to cancer support centres: patient rated outcomes and use of complementary therapies”

Dear Editor

We thank the reviewers for their comments regarding our manuscript and please see details below in response to their feedback and changes made in the manuscript.

Reviewer 1

“… suggest the authors review this section [conclusion] in light of the data presented in the article”
We thank reviewer 1 for the comments regarding our manuscript and as suggested have amended the conclusion to more accurately reflect the data presented

Reviewer 2

1. Please note the change of title as suggested by reviewer to incorporate name of the service provider in which data was collected. New manuscript title: ‘Characteristics and quality of life of patients present to SolarisCare cancer support centres: patient rated outcomes and use of complementary therapies’.
2. As suggested by review the statistics discussed in the first paragraph of the background have been updated to reflect the most up to date data available in Australia.
3. The terminology originally stating “medical misadventure” has been amended to “no adverse medical effects”.
4. Correction of grammatical error as suggested by reviewer.
5. Addition of ‘Statistical Analysis’ subtitle as suggested by reviewer.
6. As suggested the numerical values for results have been included in text, in addition to percentages.
7. Correction of sentence structure as suggested by reviewer.
8. References added for Australian based normative scores and mixed cancer population scores utilised during statistically analysis.
9. As suggested by the reviewer comments pertaining to the corroboration of previous findings have been removed from results.
10. The structure of the sentence has been addressed as suggested by the reviewer, in addition to the addition of references in order to qualify statements made by the authors. Additionally, brief discussion has been made of the influence of gender and age on variables as suggested by reviewer.
11. Additionally statistically information (r squared valued) included as suggested by reviewer.
12. As suggested by the reviewer acknowledgement of study limitations are included in the discussion (Paragraph 7).

We thank the reviewers and editors for their time and comments relating to our manuscript, and we look forward to hearing your final decision regarding publication.

Kind regards

Bonnie Furzer on behalf of the research team.