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Reviewer's report:

This seems to be a resubmission.

One of the limitations of the previous version was the lack of a checklist suitable for systematic reviews, in this version PRISMA is adopted and it seems adequate.

The article raises important issues:

1. The accurate, individualized treatment for cancer patients requires the integration of patient phenotype with pathologic factors, biological, genetic, and other molecular characteristics of the tumor;

2. The development of decision-making systems should be based on prognostic tools able to compare different treatment options and, above all, harms and benefit;

3. The systematic literature search is an invaluable scientific activity, with a well established rationale which, faithfully, reports the current (low) quality of research;

Unfortunately most of decision-making systems developed for incurable patients are not individualised and/or based on benefits, and this is well stated in the paper.

However, It must be said that the lack of personalisation is an inherent limitations of standardized protocols, customise and standardize are basically opposites and this is well known to clinicians, again, to individualise a treatment by using average data is an epidemiological chimera.

This point should at least be discussed.

In conclusion, the paper, despite the subject, reads well and manages to highlight the limits of current performance-focused DSSs.
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