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Author’s response to reviews:

1. Reviewer comments

-- Please confirm in your response whether you have addressed the comments, seen below, left by reviewer one (as this was not included in your point-by-point response):

I am pleasure to read this manuscript, entitled: OUTCOMES AFTER LONG-TERM MECHANICAL VENTILATION OF CANCER PATIENTS.

I have some considerations:

ABSTRACT: Methods I would like changes, because it is not adequately compared with the section described into the text. completed

BACKGROUND:
Line 80: Long-term MV represents tracheostomized patients?, >21 days on MV? It is important describe. chnaged

MATERIAL AND METHODS:
It is important to define who criteria were used to transfer patients to respiratory unit. completed

RESULTS:
Line 145: for patients in this ... (delete this sentence).completed
Line 155: The probability of a surviving .... (delete this sentence). All information are in Table 3. completed
Line 159: Patients with .... (delete this sentence) completed
Line 161: The medium survival for patients who had weaning as a goal .... (I think that these patients are the inclusion criteria of you sample, and I change would like to transfer this information for
Inclusion criteria section). completed

DISCUSSION:
First two paragraphs must be excluded. completed
It is important to discuss about prognosis of this kind of patients, and the importance of weaning failure as a marker of bad prognosis of this patients. completed

TABLES:
Table 2 must be deleted. deleted
Table 4 and 5 must be transformed in only one table. combined
The power of the study was in Figure 2. This is the main information and must be better explored in Results and Discussion. completed

2. Clean copy

-- At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional-supplementary files are cited within the text. completed

BMC Palliative Care operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Yes - current version is technically sound

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Thank you for the opportunity to contribute again to the peer review process for the revised submission of the manuscript entitled "Outcomes after Long-term Mechanical Ventilation of Cancer Patients (PCAR-D-19-00093R1)". The authors have satisfactorily outlined their response to the review process, many new changes are evident in the revised manuscript in response to the editor's and peer reviewer's recommendations (including an additional contemporary dataset and analysis), and the manuscript has evolved positively via this review process.