

## Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-23-82>

### Reviewer Comments

#### Reviewer A

Comment 1 Thanks for the opportunities to review this interesting manuscript. While this paper might contribute to raise awareness on the extent and level of contribution that oncology nurses in the six countries representing Europe, I think there are several ways to improve the manuscript :

The title can be revised as Growth and development of oncology nursing in six countries in Europe. Reply 1 Title has now been revised to “A review of growth and development of oncology nursing in six European countries”

Comment 2 More details of search method including medline , EONS ( European oncology nursing society) is necessary

Reply 2 The manuscript has been primarily in the perspectives of the corresponding national nursing societies who reflected the national literature. No systematic review in the medline (or any other database) databases was made as the manuscript reflected primarily the national societies perspectives’ on the status of cancer nursing. However, additional specialized literature on this review has been added according the reviewers comments.

Comment 3 Please mention the impact of COVID on the development

Reply 3 We have (further) elaborated on the impact of the pandemic on nursing education.

#### Reviewer B

Very interesting paper.

Comment 1) Adding some tables would be helpful. Table 1 - review/summarizes the similarities and differences of oncology nursing among the 7 countries would help the reader. Table 2 - current state of oncology nursing in each country. Could make this all 1 table. Add another table on actions steps.

Reply 1 We have now included one table summarizing the status in the 6 countries as per your suggestion.

Comment 2) More formatting is necessary. Need implications for practice Discussion is good but needs be split into the following

Comment 3) Add a specific implications for nursing practice implication - Is the goal to have all nurses have a specific education or knowledge base? This should be included here. Discussion should include creating a common curriculum,

collaborations for clinical experiences, etc. With the ability to do more online ( zoom, Microsoft teams)- how can the countries build off each other and/or share resources to bring everybody up to the same level. You mention work by European Oncology Nursing Society-- what about the World Health Organization?

Reply 3 Implication for nursing practice has now been added and we have elaborated on the discussion in terms of the topics raised above (e.g. common curriculum, WHO Curriculum).

Comment 4) Add a specific conclusion section - then you can summarize everything

Reply 4 We have now added the “conclusion part”

### **Reviewer C**

Comment 1 Thank you for the opportunity to review this manuscript. I would suggest that you revise the manuscript for readability. Fourteen paragraphs are 1-2 sentences. It would be easier to read if many of these were combined and give better transitions from one paragraph to the next. – Reply 1 Revised as per your suggestion

Comment 2 The only other suggestion I have is to revise the first paragraph. In the first sentence, " instigation" doesn't convey your message. I think a different word should be used. Further, it seems like the first paragraph is a very wide-angle view. It may just be a style preference, but I would consider removing the paragraph and starting with one or two sentences about nursing in general and then moving on to the information that applies to cancer nursing.

Reply 2 Thank you for your comment. We have replaced the word “instigation” with “establishment”.

In terms of the overall first paragraph, we believe we have already approached the scene from a general perspective of nursing and then moved to the specialized field of cancer nursing.

### **Reviewer D**

Comment 1 Oncology nursing is an essential part of patient care. The subject is important and of interest to several professions.

Reply 1 Thank you

Comment 2 The abstract is clear and relevant. As well as for the introduction

Reply 2 Thank you

Comment 3 Results by country: very interesting. Maybe a table with the positive points and the points to improve for each country with a comparison. This would allow to make a synthesis of these chapters.

Reply 3 A table has now been added according to your suggestion

### **Editorial Comments**

Thanks for the efforts the authors put into this writing and the support to our journal.

Please check the comments from Editorial Office. Mainly, the comments below are used to increase the transparency of your manuscript.

#### Structure of the review:

Comment 1. Due to the Author's Instruction

(<https://cdn.amegroups.cn/static/public/2.2-Structure%20of%20Review%20Articles-template-V2022.11.4.docx?v=1677724167826>), please kindly organize the structure of the manuscript.

Reply 1 Have been revised accordingly

#### Title

Comment 2. In the title, please clearly identify this manuscript as a review.

Reply 2 This has been reflected on the title

#### Keywords

Comment 3. Please add 3-5 keywords at the end of the Abstract.

Reply 3 Keywords have now been added

#### Introduction

Comment 4 Given that there are some similar reviews in this field (doi:

10.1007/s00761-006-1176-6, 10.1007/s00761-007-1183-2,

10.1007/s00761-007-1183-2, 10.1111/jan.13392), please highlight the novelty of this review in the introduction. What does this review add to existing knowledge? How does this review differ from previous reviews?

Reply 4 This aspect has been fully clarified. “This review adds to the existing knowledge by mapping the current growth and development in the aforementioned countries. Furthermore, it can serve as the basis against which any future developments in these countries can be compared to. Similarly, such comparisons can be made with other countries in Europe in this field.”

Comment 5 We hope authors use a formulation such as “Our objective is...../ We aim to.....” in the Introduction to make the research objectives clearer.

Reply 5 Has now been revised to “This manuscript aims to bring an overview....”

#### Main body

Comment 6 We hope the authors cite the literature and illustrate the impact on clinical care of various stages of the development of oncology nursing. For example, in lines 93-95 “In March 2018, AFIC published the ‘White Paper’ on the APON in Cancerology (12), which includes eight recommendations for implementation of advanced nursing roles in France.” We hope the authors discuss the effect of this policy on clinical practice.

Reply 6 We briefly touched on this topic and added the following statement, supported by corresponding literature – “Despite the many challenges and barriers to the wide implementation of the Advanced Practitioner Oncology Nurse in clinical

practice, their introduction has been correlated to the better understanding of the patients' needs and hence better care (19)”

Comment 7. Though it is a review, a separate section on the STRENGTHS and LIMITATIONS of this review is highly recommended. We think this could promote a more intellectual interpretation. Reply 7 We have briefly added this section in the discussion section

Other concerns

Comment 8. Some sentences in the manuscript need paraphrasing instead of directly using the same wording or simple word switching. Please rephrase the place (pages 2, 11, and 12) highlighted in the Similarity Report.

Reply 8 These highlighted sentences have now been rephrased. The only part is on the EU directive which is a very specific context.

Comment 9. Some points lack evidentiary support. The corresponding references should be cited. For example,

P.3, L. 85-86 “AFIC (Association Française ... working in cancer care.”

P.3, L. 96-97 “Today, nearly five ... and Cancer Centers”

P.3, L. 99-100 “Over one third ... for a Masters degree.”

Please recheck the full text to ensure all the statement is evidence-based (not just the above).

Reply 9 Reference now provided

Comment 10. Too many abbreviations increase readers' reading load, slow down reading, and make comprehension more difficult. Kindly eliminate any superfluous abbreviations, e.g. OHO, RWD, SACT, etc. Also, please define ALL abbreviations mentioned the first time, such as SARS-CoV-2 (line 58).

Reply 10 These abbreviations have been provided although they were provided in the initial submission except SARS\_CoV-2. These abbreviations we believe are important and essential to keep in the manuscript.

Comment 11. You need to provide a separate paragraph to present the footnotes (<https://apm.amegroups.com/pages/view/guidelines-for-authors#content-3-5>).

Reply 11 We don't have any footnotes

Comment 12. Funding information is missing. If there is no funding, please add “Funding: None”. Reply 12 We have added it just before the References