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ARTICLE DETAILS

| **TITLE (PROVISIONAL)** | Financial Toxicity in Patients with Lung Cancer: A Scoping Review Protocol |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **AUTHORS**             | Fu, Liang; Zhuang, Minling; Luo, Chengcan; Zhu, Ruiyun; Wu, Bei; Xu, Wenxia; Xu, Bo; Xu, Ruiyan; Ye, Xianghong |

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

| **REVIEWER**           | Christopher Longo |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| **McMaster University, DeGroote School of Business** |

| **REVIEW RETURNED**    | 22-Dec-2021 |
|------------------------|-------------|

| **GENERAL COMMENTS**   | BMJ Open 2021-057801 Financial toxicity in lung cancer: Scoping review |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                        | This is a scoping review of financial toxicity studies published up to Dec 31, 2021 related to lung cancer. As the literature grows in this area it is important to execute these types of reviews to understand the current scope of the problem. I see a few minor methodological issues, and found the search strategy lacked enough detail. There were a number of terms or wording that require updating to better reflect what the authors are attempting to do. In its current state it may be difficult for another researcher to repeat the work planned without filling in a few details as outlined below. |
|                        | My specific comment are listed below |
|                        | Pg. 2 of 18 (Abstract) line 53-54 summary should read summarize |
|                        | Pg. 3 of 18 (Abstract) line 19-20 “three parts of search terms” should read “with three key search terms” Line 25 should include initials of the two reviewers in brackets. |
|                        | Pg. 5 of 18 (Intro) line 19-20 “which generally” should read “but is generally” |
|                        | Pg. 8 of 18 (Methods) lines 22-28 in this description there is no mention of lost wages for patients or caregivers and this is a big part of financial toxicity, consider adding. |
|                        | Pg. 8 of 18 line 50-51 Consider adding EconLit to your list of databases |
|                        | Pg. 8 of 18 line 53-54 “divided into three parts” should read “search will be based on three key terms” …although it could be argued that it is two key terms “lung cancer” and “financial toxicity”. I do find this to be overly simplified, and more detail here would be helpful so that others can reproduce your work at a later time. |
|                        | Pg. 9 of 18 line 30-31 “two reviewers will screen titles and abstracts” should read “two reviewers (initials) will screen titles, and in the next
stage will screen abstacts”
Pg 9 of 18 line 40-43 I don’t understand the 75% agreement.
Please provide more detail.
Pg 10 of 18 line 30 typo “daft” should read “draft”

REVIEWER
Jacopo Giuliani
Mater Salutis General Hospital

REVIEW RETURNED
12-Jan-2022

GENERAL COMMENTS
A good idea, with possible interesting developments. In reference to the intervention strategies to deal with financial toxicity, please refer to the introduction of biosimilars, citing these paper:
- Giuliani J, Fiorica F, Albanese V, Bonetti A. Financial toxicity and cancer treatments: Help from biosimilars - The explanatory case of bevacizumab. Eur J Cancer. 2021;143:40-42.

VERSIO 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE
Reviewer: 1
Dr. Christopher Longo, McMaster University
Comments to the Author:
See attached document.
This is a scoping review of financial toxicity studies published up to Dec 31, 2021 related to lung cancer. As the literature grows in this area it is important to execute these types of reviews to understand the current scope of the problem.
I see a few minor methodological issues, and found the search strategy lacked enough detail. There were a number of terms or wording that require updating to better reflect what the authors are attempting to do.
In its current state it may be difficult for another researcher to repeat the work planned without filling in a few details as outlined below.
My specific comment are listed below
Pg. 2 of 18 (Abstract) line 53-54 summary should read summarize
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Pg. 3 of 18 (Abstract) line 19-20 “three parts of search terms” should read “with three key searchterms”
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Line 25 should include initials of the two reviewers in brackets.
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Pg. 5 of 18 (Intro) line 19-20 “which generally” should read “but is generally”
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Pg. 8 of 18 (Methods) lines 22-28 in this description there is no mention of lost wages for patients or caregivers and this is a big part of financial toxicity, consider adding.
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We consulted with Professor Bo Xu and Ruiyan Xu, and added lost wages for patients or caregivers based on your suggestions.

Pg. 8 of 18 line 50-51 Consider adding EconLit to your list of databases
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Pg. 8 of 18 line 53-54 “divided into three parts” should read “search will be based on three key terms” …although it could be argued that it is two key terms “lung cancer” and “financial toxicity”. I do find this to be overly simplified, and more detail here would be helpful so that others can reproduce your work at a later time.
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Pg. 9 of 18 line 30-31 “two reviewers will screen titles and abstracts” should read “two reviewers (initials) will screen titles, and in the next stage will screen abstracts”
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Pg 9 of 18 line 40-43 I don’t understand the 75% agreement. Please provide more detail.
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. This is based on recommendations of the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis on scoping review protocol (Page 419), the original description is as follows: ‘Team only starts screening when 75% (or greater) agreement is achieved’.

Pg 10 of 18 line 30 typo “daft” should read “draft”
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your pertinent comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Reviewer: 2
Dr. Jacopo Giuliani, Mater Salutis General Hospital
Comments to the Author:
A good idea, with possible interesting developments. In reference to the intervention strategies to deal with financial toxicity, please refer to the introduction of biosimilars, citing these paper:
- Giuliani J, Fiorica F, Albanese V, Bonetti A. Financial toxicity and cancer treatments: Help from biosimilars - The explanatory case of bevacizumab. Eur J Cancer. 2021;143:40-42.
Authors’ response: Dear Professor, Thank you very much for your kind comments. We have revised the manuscript according to your comments.

Thank you very much again for your rigorous review and insightful suggestions. Your pertinent comments greatly improve the quality of this paper, and also broaden our horizons in this research field.

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

| REVIEWER       | Jacopo Giuliani  |
|----------------|------------------|
| Mater Salutis General Hospital |

| REVIEW RETURNED | 21-Apr-2022 |

| GENERAL COMMENTS | Smart and interesting. I did not find any weaknesses. |