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Author’s response to reviews:

Thank you for providing us the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript. We have appreciated all the comments and questions that the reviewers provided to help us make our manuscript stronger. Please see the attached word document regarding our revisions as well.

1. Lines 208: comparison of baseline scores would be more appropriate in the results section, specifically I would move to around line 235-238 when discussing similarity at baseline for other characteristics.

Author Reply: We have moved the statement about differences in baseline scores between primary and secondary outcomes to lines 233-337 (Results, Page 11, Line 233-237).

2. Table 2: I think it would be clearer, and would better reflect the order presented in the text, if you first reported the CIPN Sensory and CIPN Motor in all patients (with "n" perhaps) and then presented the results for CIPN Sensory and CIPN Motor in subcategories under the heading of "High Cumulative Dose Category". In the current format it's unclear what the difference is between the "CIPN Motor" subcategory under "CIPN Sensory High Cumulative Dose Category" and the next category of CIPN Motor High Cumulative Dose Category" (though I eventually figured it out).
Author Reply: We have changed the formatting of the table so that the sensory and motor CIPN data for individuals in the high cumulative dose category are under the newly created, “High Cumulative Dose Category” subheading. We are happy to revise further if the new ordering is still unclear. The order of the table now reflects the order of how the data is presented in the text (Table 2, Page 33, Line 716).

3. Table 3: Recommend moving "(n=107)" and "(n=105)" to the table footnote.

Author Reply: We have moved (n=107) and (n=105) to the table footnote (Table 3, Page 35, Line 758).

4. Line 309: missing "there" between "as" and "were"

Author Reply: We have added the missing word (Discussion, Page 14, Line 309).

5. Line 329: It would have been interesting to report data for how many patients in each group clicked on messages, since that data seems to be available, but not necessary.

Author Reply: Table 3 provides information on how many intervention group participants were sent ESRA-C self-care messages for various symptoms. Control group participants did not receive these messages. We have edited Table 3 and the associated information in the text to clarify that the table describes the frequency of intervention group participants who scored above the pre-specified thresholds associated with each symptom/measure that prompted the receipt of symptom specific ESRA-C self-care messages (Table 3, Page 35, Line 750).

6. Lines 332-336: There are either missing words or this is two sentences that should be separated. Somewhere the wording gets screwy.

Author Reply: We have revised the section in question to increase clarity. Our main message is that future work is needed to identify mediators of physical function preservation following web-based symptom assessment and management use to tailor such intervention in the future to positively influence physical function (Discussion, Page 15, Line 334-3356).