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: 18 Oct 2018

Reviewer: Justine Slomian

Reviewer's report:

Abstract

Objectives should be found in the Background section. The Methods section is not well written. This section should present what kind of study the researchers will perform, which population(s) they will include, etc. This information does not appear for the moment. In addition, what do the authors mean by "epidemiology"? This could mean a lot of things …

Background

Line 63. "These studies report RTW rates varying between 40% to [write "and"] 80%15". The reference is a systematic review, this should be specified.

Methods

The Methods section is quickly very specific. It is necessary to read the whole manuscript to understand what authors intend to do. Therefore, it would be helpful to begin the Methods section by a summary of what authors will do (type of study - The reviewer assumes the study is a retrospective one -, chronology, population, etc.). It would also be helpful to have a separate section on the study population with inclusion and exclusion criteria. Indeed, in the manuscript, it is stated that the "BCR only retained those aged 16-64 at the date of incidence" but authors chose to include patients aged between 20 and 64 years. This should be explained.

Please be vigilant with the tenses used. A protocol should be written in the future tense. Thus, it would be advised to better distinguish between what has already been done (using the present perfect or past tense) from what has still to be done, using the future tense.
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