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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to reviewer 2

Reviewer #2: It is inappropriate to present results for the first time in the discussion section. It is also misleading to hide the fact that the difference in survival among treatments is a month or so. I would put these results in the results section. You can say that it is an illustrative example of showing the absolute effect (this way you won't be criticized for not doing this for all the comparisons). I would also mention that in the abstract. No need to hide what is arguably the most important information, for a patient, at the end of the discussion section which no one will read.

Answer:

We moved this finding to the results section as suggested by the reviewer and we mention now that this is an illustrative example (see end of paragraph in results for overall survival).

However, we do not think that we should add this finding in the abstract because as we have already mentioned in our previous response letter this is only a rough estimate that has been obtained under strong assumptions which are not certainly plausible. Hence, this absolute effect estimate should be interpreted with caution. As such, we leave the final decision to the editor on whether it is appropriate to mention this absolute effect in the abstract or not.