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Reviewer's report:

The author appears to have addressed the concerns of the previous reviewers. I think this is a timely perspective on something which exercised me when I worked on technology appraisals for treatments in oncology where the aim was the extension of survival or progression free survival - the lack of focus on HRQoL when this seemed to me to be of paramount importance. It's clearly a personal perspective and that gives it much of its force.

I would say that it identifies key areas of importance - the need for publication of all trial data - I would reference the ALL TRIALS initiative here - apologies if this has been done and I missed the reference, the key importance of adverse event data, the need for consideration of HRQoL in a patient-relevant way - and the need for standardised reporting (as well as simple publication). I don't think I have much to add except that I wanted a clearer summary articulation of what the initiative the author is calling for might look like. I was also struck by the fact that many of the treatment types discussed are given at a point at which they qualify for End of Life status under the NICE criteria - where a higher threshold of cost-effectiveness is used. I wondered if the patient perspective on that had been explored fully and whether the author feels there is scope to do so.

This paper seems to me to have been fully reviewed already and my comments are mostly relevant to things that I think are interesting - rather than suggestions of changes which need to be made. It's clearly a patient perspective piece and I'm commenting largely as an academic in this area - I think it will provoke valuable discussions when published.
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