

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tlcr-23-469>

Reviewer A

The manuscript entitled First-line versus second-line use of pralsetinib in treatment of rearranged during

4 transfection (RET) fusion-positive advanced non-small cell lung cancer: a cost5 effectiveness analysis is well written and acceptable after minor revision.

1. PRL should be used as abbreviation in place of Pralsetinib throughout the whole manuscript.

Reply 1: Thanks for your suggestion. Pralsetinib is now modified throughout the whole manuscript accordingly.

Changes in the text: Throughout the whole manuscript.

2. Add one paragraph to add physical and chemical properties as per the reference article and cite <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35598228/>

DOI: 10.1007/s12272-022-01385-3

Reply 2: Thanks for your suggestion. Physical and chemical properties has now been added accordingly.

Changes in the text: Page 9, Line 6-14.

Reviewer B

This is a well-written paper. I have a few comments below for the authors' consideration:

1. Readers, such as myself, may not be familiar with the ARROW trial. It would be helpful to understand what the median follow-up was from the trial to contextualize the results.

Reply 1: Thank you for your suggestion. The median follow-up, as mentioned in the manuscript, represents the median total time span for patient follow-up observation in the clinical trials. We updated the detailed explanation in the manuscript.

Changes in the text: Page 10, Line 17.

2. It is my understanding that pralsetinib is an oral medication, which most chemo is administered via IV. While the authors mentioned administration costs for each drug was considered in the model, it would be helpful to see what the difference in oral vs. IV costs were. Would be good to see all the other costs that were included in the model and the associated references.

Reply 2: Thank you for your comments. We tracked the administration costs for each cycle of chemotherapy, excluding the oral PRL treatment, in our analysis. The difference in costs

between oral and IV was considered as the administration costs. Other costs were not taken into consideration since they have less impact on the outcome. We updated the detailed explanation in the manuscript. All the costs included in the model are listed in Table S3.

Changes in the text: Page 6, Line 14.

3. Page 8, Line 34 the "exorbitant" language seems unnecessary, suggest to tone down to sound less editorial

Reply 3: Thank you for your suggestion. The word "exorbitant" has now been modified to "high".

Changes in the text: Page 9, Line 3.