Author’s response to reviews

Title: A matched-pair analysis on survival and response rates between German and non-German cancer patients treated at a Comprehensive Cancer Center

Authors:

Marie Budde (mariebudde@t-online.de)
Walther Kuhn (walther.kuhn@donau-isar-klinikum.de)
Mignon-Denise Keyver-Paik (Mignon-Denise.Keyver-Paik@ukbonn.de)
Friedrich Bootz (Friedrich.Bootz@ukbonn.de)
Jörg Kalff (Joerg.Kalff@ukbonn.de)
Stefan Müller (Stefan.mueller@ukbonn.de)
Thomas Bieber (Thomas.Bieber@ukbonn.de)
Peter Brossart (Peter.Brossart@ukbonn.de)
Hartmut Vatter (Hartmut.Vatter@ukbonn.de)
Ulrich Herrlinger (Ulrich.Herrlinger@ukbonn.de)
Dieter Wirtz (Dieter.Wirtz@ukbonn.de)
Hans Schild (Hans.Schild@ukbonn.de)
Glen Kristiansen (Glen.Kristiansen@ukbonn.de)
Thorsten Pietsch (Torsten.Pietsch@ukbonn.de)
Stefan Aretz (Stefan.Aretz@ukbonn.de)
Franziska Geiser (Franziska.Geiser@ukbonn.de)
Lukas Radbruch (Lukas.Radbruch@ukbonn.de)
Rudolf Reich (Rudolf.reich@ukbonn.de)
Christian Strassburg (Christian.Strassburg@ukbonn.de)
Dirk Skowasch (Dirk.Skowasch@ukbonn.de)
Markus Essler (Markus.Essler@ukbonn.de)
Nicole Ernstmann (Nicole.Ernstmann@ukbonn.de)
Jennifer Landsberg (jenny.landsberg@ukbonn.de)
Benjamin Funke (benjamin.funke@ukbonn.de)
Ingo G. H. Schmidt-Wolf (picasso@uni-bonn.de)

Version: 2 Date: 26 Sep 2019

Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript entitled “A matched-pair analysis on survival and response rates between German and non-German cancer patients treated at a Comprehensive Cancer Center” as a publication in your journal. We are very pleased that it is potentially acceptable for publication after having carried out your revisions.

We carefully read the necessary corrections and answered it separately which you can find in the part below. Additionally, we changed our main text according to the suggestions.

With this letter, we uploaded a clean, final version of our manuscript, the final tables and figures. We are looking forward to receiving your answer.

Again thank you very much for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Prof. Schmidt-Wolf

for the authors
1. Reviewer:

Please remove any files from the file inventory that you do not wish to see published.

Answer:

We removed all files that we do not wish to see published.

2. Reviewer:

Please include the date of registration along with the trial registration numbers (TRN) at the end of the abstract.

Answer:

As our study was retrospective it was not registered.

3. Reviewer:

Research involving human subjects (including human material or human data) that is reported in the manuscript must have been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee. Research carried out on humans must be in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration (http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html). A statement to this effect must appear in the ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section of the Declarations of the manuscript, including the name of the body which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate.

If the need for ethics approval were waived, then please clearly state this, including the name of the ethics committee that provided the exemption, together with the reasons for the waiver, or a reference to the relevant legislation.

Answer:

We now have completed the ’Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section describing the reason for our ethic committee to waive the need for ethics approval in our study (Declarations section, line 494-497, page 20).
4. Reviewer:

For all research involving human subjects, informed consent to participate in the study should be obtained from participants (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 16) and a statement to this effect should appear in the ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section of the Declarations including whether the consent was written. When reporting on such studies, individual patient data should not be made available unless consent for publication has also been obtained.

If the need for informed consent has been waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this with details, including the name of the Board or a reference to the relevant legislation in the ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section of the Declarations.

Answer:

Individual patient data is not identifiable in our study as we have stated in the Declarations section now (Declarations section, line 494-496, page 20).

5. Reviewer:

In the Funding section of the Declarations please indicate the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript. If no specific funding was received for this study, please clearly indicate this in the Funding section.

Answer:

No specific funding was received for this study which is now clearly indicated in the Funding section (Declarations section, line 509-510, page 21).

6. Reviewer:

Please include a statement in the Authors’ contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

Answer:

We included a statement in the Authors’ contributions section stating that all authors have read and approved the manuscript now (Declarations section, line 523, page 21).
7. Reviewer:

At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethrough or text in different colours. All relevant tables and figures should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.

Answer:

Additionally to this letter, we uploaded a final, clean version of our manuscript as well as a final version of all tables and figures.