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Reviewer’s report:

This is an excellent manuscript reporting the results of a mixed methods study conducted amongst cancer survivors who are or have been treated for cancer, about their use during and after anti-cancer treatment. However, there are some questions and recommendations for consideration, these may strengthen the manuscript completely.

How may the sampling strategy in both the qualitative and survey impact the results?

How were demographics collected in participants requiring an interpreter? Were they translated in written form, or information collected via interview with interpreter?

Survey items: can you specify how many of the 26 questions were closed and how many were open questions?

It would be preferable to include the opening statement of the results after the section describing the sample and response rate. Its present location disconnects it from the subsequent results reported.

Table 1. Given the small number of participants in the focus groups, reporting percentages should be rounded to the nearest whole number. Use of decimals in this context is not informative.

Table 2: the text for long-term treatment, including … is truncated and unreadable.

Are the quotes in section 'perceived positive impact on side-effects and recovery' all from the Chinese focus group or a mix - it is not possible to tell from what is reported.

Page 29/39 line 766: why is there a need to state this is the largest study of its kind? This does not add to the importance or strength of the study - it stands on its own merits. Recommend amending this statement.

Page 29/39 line 770: refers to findings aligning with other research, but cites none. Please included citations here.

Similarly lines 775-777: are there references further supporting the assertion it is not surprising patients expressed a need for greater IO services.
Page 29/30 line 791-792: the phrasing 'patient affordability' seems odd, this implies the patients are affordable rather than the therapy. Consider rewording.

Page 31/39 line 836: I am not sure why this statement is included, use of social media networks was not measured as an outcome in the study, it is unclear on what basis the statement was made, particularly as efficiency of recruitment is not reported in via any proportional numbers. Please reconsider the statement.

Typos

Page 20/39 line 510: change "were better placed that specialists" to "were better placed than specialists"

Page 23/39 line 617 recommend spelling out asap within the quote

Page 26/39 line 696 'complimentary' should be 'complementary'

Additional file 2:

Question 13 appears to replicate exactly question 12 was this as the survey was sent out or an error in constructing this file?

Also under question 12, text reads 'If yes go to Q18; if NO go to Q22' mean either way questions 13-17 are not answered - please clarify.

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.

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

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