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This paper tells about the retrospective analysis of the patient records of 200 mesothelioma patients from one hospital. The eligibility for chemotherapy has been discussed in a multidisciplinary team. Eligible patients did or did not choose for chemotherapeutic treatment. Groups were compared, Reasons to abstain from active treatment were given.

The paper is well written.

Major point:

The discussion gives a good oversight of the strengths and weaknesses of the study. Unfortunately, the role of the medical doctor and the interaction between the doctor and patient seems underexposed. The impression is given that all patients who seem eligible for chemotherapy according to the MDT can choose for themselves whether or not to receive chemotherapy. It might rather well be that this decision is greatly influenced by the (implicit) advice of the medical doctor.

Minor point:

reference 5: The data have been updated at ASCO 2005 revealing a survival gain of 4 months...
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