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**Reviewer's report:**

I would like to congratulate you on this protocol, and to wish you the best of luck for its The authors have satisfactorily addressed most of my comments. I have a few minor comments on this revised version:

Survival defined by age: what I meant to say was that attained age is an imperfect measure of overall survival, since one doesn't know the age at cancer diagnosis. For example, consider two patients, each diagnosed with a gonadal germ cell tumour and who both attain the age of 30 year. However, one patient was diagnosed at age 15 and the other at age 28. In spite of having the same attained age, these two patients have in fact very different survival experiences.

Page 8, line 20: the agreement between two reviewers is a proportion, rather than a rate.

Page 13, lines 10-12: would remove the sentence for the pragmatic approach in the English language, as this is not consistent with what is done for the quantitative studies (described in page 8, line 14).

Page 15, lines 15-16: 'using methods of first converting long-rank estimates into log hazards ratios' - I don't think this is correct. Please delete this part of the sentence, isn't needed really.
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