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Reviewer's report:

This is an excellent article, well researched, presented and written in an engaging way. I learnt a lot from reading the article and it will be useful to those who work in cancer care and want to understand the state of play. There are a couple of minor comments/suggestions below:

page 7 useful to explain "internet amalgam" (lines 37-38)

page 8 change "study reported herein" to "illustrated in Figure 2" (lines 23-26)

page 8 delete "a fortuitous theoretic" and replace with "A grounded methodology ..." (line 48)

page 8 Delete the word "nevertheless" (line 58)

page 9 Consider deleting the para "Note: ... herein" (lines 14-20)

page 9 define "the gold standards" (lines 34-5)

page 10 replace "efficacious" with "effective" (lines 54-55)

page 22 Clumsy sentence "statistically significantly" - reword (line 21)

page 26 the word "remarkably" (line 33) does not make sense unless the author explains why it is remarkable

page 28 Spelling "disserve" to "deserve" (line 30)

page 31 Delete "more and" (line44)

I hope these are helpful to the author.
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