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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Response to the reviewers’ comments: minor revisions

Manuscript title: Depressive symptoms and performance status are associated with (Health-Related) Quality of Life in patients with advanced-stage lung cancer: an observational multi-center cohort study (BCAN-D-19-01412)

We thank the reviewers for the valuable comments that helped to improve the content of the manuscript. We have taken notice of the reviewers’ comments and have revised our manuscript in accordance with the given suggestions.

Reviewer reports:

Ping Yang (Reviewer 2):
Authors adequately addressed or justified all concerns of this reviewer.

Research Square Reviewer 1 (Reviewer 3):

Requested revisions:

1. Wonder if (pg 3) it should be partner and not spouse?
Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment. In the cited references according to the patient characteristics patients could be married or cohabiting.

Changes to the manuscript:
We changed in the fourth paragraph and the last paragraph of the introduction ‘spouse’ to ‘spouse/partner’.

2. The data collected are old from patients 6-8 years ago(2012-2014) - what is the logic behind using this time frame?

Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment. The first author was writing his PhD thesis, which consisted of several scientific papers. This paper was one of the final papers to be completed. In addition, a publication process takes time. Moreover, the first author is in the middle of his medical training as a resident in pulmonary medicine. In other words, he had to divide his time between clinical practice (training) and his scientific training. These factors made that there has been an delay in publication.

Changes to the manuscript:
No changes were made to the manuscript.

3. How many times were patients contacted to complete the survey?

Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment. Patients were once asked to complete the questionnaires during a physical consultation or telephone call after they received extensive information about the study in layman terms. We did not repeatedly asked patients to complete the survey to prevent that they could feel obliged to complete the questionnaires.

Changes to the manuscript:
In the Methods section under Procedures we added ‘Patients were asked once to complete the questionnaires and not repeatedly to prevent that they could feel obliged to comply to the researchers’ request’.

4. There is a potential response bias in that possibly the most optimistic of patients or those who had a caregiver who could help with the survey were the ones who returned it.

Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Changes to the manuscript:
In the Discussion section in the paragraph that discusses the limitations we added the following: ‘Third, there is a potential response bias in that possibly the most optimistic of patients or those who had a caregiver who could help with the survey were the ones who returned the questionnaires.’

5. Table 3 is difficult to read - the x axis bleeds into the page numbering

Response: We thank the reviewer for pointing this out.

Changes to the manuscript:
The lay-out of table 3 was changed to help interpret the table.
ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
The authors have been responsive the to the extensive prior reviews - some minor issues remain

Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment.

Changes to the manuscript:
The manuscript was changed as mentioned above according to the suggestions of the reviewer.