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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Thorsteinsson,

Thank you for your decision. We are greatly honoured that BMC Psychology finds our manuscript potentially acceptable for publication. We appreciate the feedback and think that the suggestions improved our manuscript. We have therefore made a number of changes, especially to page 6 (the Results section). All changes are also highlighted in yellow in the uploaded version of the manuscript.

1. Statistics were presented without standard deviations and in a couple of sentences you refer to two means.
   Standard deviations have now been added to the highlighted means. These changes were made to the Results section (page 5 line 36-39, and page 6 line 1, 8, 9, 13, 18). A sentence in the Results section were two means were discussed has also been changed (page 5 line 39). The other sentence was removed when the Results section was restructured (see point 5).

2. There are some typos and grammar errors in the text which I have highlighted.
   We have removed the sentence about trial registration from the Abstract (page 2, line 23). Typos have been corrected on page 2 line 6, 7, 19, page 7 line 15, page 8 line 12, page 9 line 13. A grammar error was changed on page 8, line 19-20.

3. There are some statements made that seem without foundation or require references.
   References have now been added to page 7 line 23 and page 8 line 10-15 in the Discussion section. This resulted in three additional references in the reference list. A few sentences in the Discussion section (page 7 line 31-32, and page 8 line 4-7) have also been clarified.

4. The paper might benefit from a few graphs, then differences and effects sizes discussed in relation to these.
A graph (figure 1) has now been added in order to visualize the results from table 2. Rather than having separate graphs for self-reports and parent-proxy reports, we decided on combining them. That way it illustrates both the differences between patient groups and parent-proxy versus self-reports. The differences are now discussed in the Results section on page 6. This section has thus been expanded. In order to better discuss the effect sizes, a new reference was also added.

5. Maybe separate out results, so that you discuss brain tumour, then leukeamia patients in a different paragraph.
We have restructured the Measures of fatigue section, which means that major changes were made to page 6, line 6-25.

We are looking forward to hearing from you again.

On behalf of all authors,
Elin Irestorm