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Reviewer's report:

Interesting paper that aims at estimating the loss of productivity (in terms of costs) caused by lung cancer premature mortality.

The introduction, methods and the description of the results are clearly expound.

Some comments and considerations that could help to enrich the paper:

Authors applied the "human capital" approach, which is one of the current methods to estimate productivity loss due to illness. Authors should spend a few words more to justify this choice for this particular health outcome (lung cancer mortality).

Authors found (in line with the literature) a growing trend in lung cancer mortality in female, while in male it remains stable (table 1). Nonetheless, the YPPLL in table 1 and the "productivity loss" are presented (and commented) considering the two genders together (Table 2).

Considering the well-known differences between men and women in lung cancer incidence and mortality due to the differences in the epidemiological profile of the use of tobacco, correlated with the emancipation process in the labour market of women (early 80s and 90s with health effects in 2000s), authors should present the results of the "productivity loss" and the percentage of "mortality cost" stratified by gender.

This option seems to be more informative for both policy and research implications.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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