Reviewer’s report

**Title:** The EMPCAN Study: Study of The Evolution of The Socio-Economic Position of Workers With Cancer. Study Protocol of a Population-Based Cohort Study.

**Version:** 0 **Date:** 08 Oct 2018

**Reviewer:** Stefania D’Angelo

**Reviewer's report:**

This paper describes thoroughly the design of the EMPCAN study. The study seems to be well set up and aims to describe the return to work after certain types of cancer using several administrative Belgian datasets. Just a couple of points below:

- **Abstract:** what do the Authors mean when they talk about "Epidemiology" is used in order to...Epidemiology is an extremely broad term and they should be more specific here.
- **Why are the authors collecting information on 14 different states (that relate to socio-economic position) while then declare they will be using only 4 of them in the analysis?**
- **A major limit of the study consists in the lack of personal information. Are people with a cancer diagnosis even willing to go back to work? It would also be important to know if people have other co-morbidities. That would be an important determinant on how soon they can go back to work. The authors should discuss in a bit more length the lack of this type of information**
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