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**Reviewer’s report:**

The manuscript has improved a lot. A few issues, however, should be considered before publication.

1) Be consistent with separators etc. while writing numbers, i.e. 2018 patients vs 2,018 patients or b = 0.74 vs. b = .74. Check all numbers throughout the manuscript.

2) Please discuss the potential selection bias related to response rate. Have you any idea who did not answer?

3) Please justify more specifically why you decided to drop just the variables you dropped because of multicollinearity? Did you consider those to be less important/interesting among correlated variables?

4) Select parameterization that offers most information about differences. For example, try to use the Southwestern Center as a reference center in your multivariable model - It is likely that Midwestern and Eastern Center differ significantly from the Southwestern. Or use Eastern Center as a reference if you want both ORs to be above one.

5) Try to put cancer diagnosis to your multivariable model (categorization with breast, lung, prostate, colorectal, pancreatic, and other should be enough). Does that change your results, i.e. is satisfaction mainly driven by the condition or is there an “independent” satisfaction effect regardless of cancer type?

6) Please reword the last sentence in your conclusions. Just tell what can be concluded from your study (instead of describing what you reported in the study).
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