Reviewer's report

Title: Quality of Life measurements as an indicator for timing of support after oesophagectomy for cancer - A prospective study

Version: 1 Date: 19 July 2014

Reviewer: Krzysztof Tomaszewski

Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

your manuscript entitled “Quality of Life measurements as an indicator for timing of support after oesophagectomy for cancer - A prospective study” is an interesting one. However it has several drawbacks, mainly stemming from the fact that in fact it was a part of larger RCT, and not a QoL trial designed separately with its own patient group.

Major revisions:

1. Major language corrections, both grammatical and lexical, are needed throughout the whole manuscript. Please refer the manuscript to a native speaker for necessary corrections.

2. Regarding Table 2 - as many factors can influence an individuals’ quality-of-life, the authors should also present (in the demographic characteristics) the marital status of the participants, as well as information whether the patients lived alone/with spouse/children etc.

3. The following statement from the Conclusions “Treatment with proton pump inhibitors improves the results.” needs to be changed to reflect that PPI use only produced a significant change in the QLQ-OES18 scores, which was not reflected in the QLQ-C30.

4. The "Methodological considerations" part of the Discussion should be shortened as parts of it are not crucial to the manuscript.

5. The Discussion section needs to be considerably improved, focusing more on the results of the study and their implications:
   - first, the Authors need to clearly state, in a separate subparagraph, the limitations of the current study;
   - secondly, the Authors should supply a possible explanation for the QoL nadir seen at 2 months post-surgery;
   - thirdly, having both the QLQ-C30 and the QLQ-OES18 scores, the Authors should supply a proposition/suggestion of a support program that could be implemented in the mentioned patients at the 2 month post-surgery time point.

6. Figures 1, 3 and 5 do not present enough data to justify the use of figures. Please present all the data from Figures 1, 3 and 5 in a form of a single table (or incorporate them into Figures 2, 4, 6).
7. The overlapping parts of "Statistics" and "Instruments and measurements" should be deleted.

Minor essential revisions:
1. Minor spelling mistakes have to be corrected e.g. 8:th -> should be 8th / "After surgery also functions have also been shown negatively affected [1-3]." -> double use of the word "also" or "bout" -> instead of "about" etc..

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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