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Reviewer's report:

The article presents the results of a trial to test whether aerobic or cognitive training or both provide superior improvements to cognitive function. The article is detailed and well-written. I have a few minor comments to improve the clarity of the manuscript.

Pg 3 - should be "e.g., alkylating agents"

Pg 4, 10 - please add references to support the following statements "tai chi and Qigong..." and "Qigong was frequently associated ...." and "few studies have evaluated the ...."

Pg 5 - please include the name of the university review board and the ethics approval number.

Pg 5 - the authors note that all groups received the flexibility training intervention, however it is not clear how or when the intervention groups completed this. Was it completed 3 times per week in addition to the 30 minute intervention sessions, which would make intervention sessions 1 hr duration?

Pg 5 - Was the study protocol registered with a clinical trials registry? The CONSORT checklist states this is N/A, but it's not clear why.

Pg 9 - The following sentences are unclear "..the COG group showed no statistically significant improvements in cognitive function. In contrast, the COG group showed no significant improvements in cognitive function using 12 difference cognitive assessment instruments"

Table 1: there are 7 participants in the AER group, but only 6 cancer types listed.
Randomisation: the authors could add more detail about the randomisation process, including whether participants were randomised in a 1:1 ratio, whether there was any block size, did participants know about all of the study group options, were the control group aware that they were in the control group?
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