

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

This paper was submitted to a another journal from BMJ but declined for publication following peer review. The authors addressed the reviewers' comments and submitted the revised paper to BMJ Paediatrics Open. The paper was subsequently accepted for publication at BMJ Paediatrics Open.

## ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	INFLUENCE OF HEALTH-INSURANCE STATUS ON PEDIATRIC NON-HODGKIN LYMPHOMA TREATMENT IN KENYA
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Martijn, Hugo; Njuguna, Festus; Olbara, Gilbert; Langat, Sandra; Skiles, Jodi; Martin, Stephen; Vik, Terry; van de Ven, Peter; Kaspers, Gertjan; Mostert, saskia

## VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Brown, Nick sdhft and aku Competing interests: none
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	02-Jun-2017

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>I enjoyed your paper which is clear and concise</p> <p>The abstract could be more punchy: the first or second sentence should include the adjusted hazard ratio as this is your bottom line. The same is true in the results section</p> <p>eg Event free survival/ treatment failure in children with/without health insurance was significantly better worse, adjusted HR... (p&lt;0.005)</p> <p>The last sentence of the abstract should be omitted as you cannot infer causality with this design. You have showed an association between non-insurance and outcome and you should not extrapolate. The readers can make their own minds up.</p> <p>The discussion should acknowledge the limitations of any retrospective study</p> <p>Impact is a noun, not a verb. Please say 'had an impact on' rather than 'impacted'</p>
-------------------------	---

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Sitairesmi, Mei Neni Departemen of Child Health, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia Competing interests: I also conducted a study: Comparing treatment outcome of childhood cancer before and after implementation of universal health coverage in Indonesia
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	22-Jun-2017

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>This is an interesting and important article. It will give an additional evidence of the importance of Universal Health Coverage (UHC) on ensuring all people access a medical care.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Could you add Socio Economic status for the analysis as confounder factor?</li> <li>2. Could you explain if UHC cover all expenses of medical care?</li> <li>3. It would be better if figure 1 merge with figure 3 and figure 2 merge with figure 4.</li> </ol>
-------------------------	---

## VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

### REVIEWER 1:

Thank you very much for your review and the useful comments.

Hereby I present you our responses:

Comment 1: The abstract could be more punchy: the first or second sentence should include the adjusted hazard ratio as this is your bottom line. The same is true in the results section: Event free survival/ treatment failure in children with/without health insurance was significantly better/worse, adjusted HR... ( $p < 0.005$ )

Response:

We have adjusted the text according to your suggestion.

Comment 2:

The last sentence of the abstract should be omitted as you cannot infer causality with this design. You have showed an association between non-insurance and outcome and you should not extrapolate. The readers can make their own minds up.

Response:

We have adjusted the text according to your suggestion.

Comment 3:

The discussion should acknowledge the limitations of any retrospective study

Response:

We have adjusted the text according to your suggestion.

Comment 4:

Impact is a noun, not a verb. Please say 'had an impact on' rather than 'impacted'

Response: Thank you for the advice, but unfortunately we were unable to find the word "impacted" in the text.

### REVIEWER 2:

Thank you very much for your review and the useful comments.

Hereby I present you our responses:

Comment 1: Could you add Socio Economic status for the analysis as confounder factor?

Response: In this retrospective medical records study data on socio-economic or financial status of families was not recorded. Therefore we are unable to add socio-economic status for the analysis as confounder factor. We have now addressed in the Discussion that a limitation of a retrospective medical records study is that only pre-existing data can be analysed and that some important data may be missing.

Comment 2:

Could you explain if UHC cover all expenses of medical care?

Response: We have adjusted the text according to your suggestion.

Comment 3:

It would be better if figure 1 merge with figure 3 and figure 2 merge with figure 4.

Response: Although we understand your viewpoint and appreciate your suggestion, we feel that the Figures should remain as it is for clarity.