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To: Editor of BMC Cancer.

Please find attached via online submission, a copy of our revised manuscript entitled “Characteristics of attitude and recommendation of Oncologists toward exercise in South Korea: A cross sectional survey study” that we are resubmitting for further consideration for publication.

We thank the reviewers for his/her thorough review of the manuscript and for their helpful suggestions. We are very glad that we were able to improve the manuscript by implementing all of the suggestions and comments from the reviewer.

We feel the changes made to the manuscript have improved its clarity, and hope that it is now in a form acceptable for publication in BMC Cancer. Thank you for your continued kind consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Justin Y. Jeon
Professor, Department of Sport and Leisure Studies, Yonsei University
Reviewer's report
Title: Characteristics of attitude and recommendation of Oncologists toward exercise in South Korea: A cross sectional survey study
Version: 6 Date: 17 December 2014
Reviewer: Asmita Patel

Reviewer's report:
Accept after minor essential revisions.
Reviewer’s report (Revision two)

Manuscript: BMC Cancer: Characteristics of exercise recommendations of oncologists in South Korea: a cross sectional survey study

Comments to the Authors
I would like to thank the authors for the amendments they have made to the manuscript.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes, the study aims are clearly defined.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.

9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes.

10. Is the writing acceptable?
    Yes. Minor revision: page 13, line 3. Please change to: ‘than the ACSM guidelines.”

    As suggested, we have revised the manuscript from ‘guideline’ to ‘guidelines’.
Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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