

Answering reviewers

Thank you for your valuable advices to improve our manuscript.

There are similar advices from Reviewer 2 and 3, so we have modified accordingly.

Reviewer 1: No suggestions given/suggested to changed

Reply: Thanks for response

Reviewer 2:

1. Introduction: Suggestions: The introduction could benefit from more statistical data or empirical studies to strengthen the argument. For example, data on common symptoms experienced by cancer patients during treatment (such as pain, anxiety, depression) and how these symptoms affect quality of life would better illustrate the limitations of the current care model.

Reply: Changes done.

2. The Necessity of Integration: Suggestions: For the necessity of "integrating rehabilitation and palliative care," could you provide more specific clinical cases or research findings to enhance the practicality and persuasiveness of the argument? Further exploration of the challenges cancer patients face when receiving integrated care, how these challenges can be overcome, and the patients' acceptance of integrated care would be valuable.

Reply: Changes done.

3. Methods for Integration: Suggestions: Could you provide more specific operational details on the "shared care pathways"? For example, how can rehabilitation care and palliative care be seamlessly integrated in practice? Are there any existing models or cases that can be referenced? For the construction of multidisciplinary teams, could you elaborate on the specific roles and responsibilities of each team member, and how effective collaboration between team members can be ensured?

Reply: Changes done.

4. Future Models: Suggestions: The article could explore how to gradually introduce these innovative technologies into the current healthcare system, considering challenges such as device costs, patient acceptance, and privacy issues. Regarding policy advocacy, can you delve deeper into specific policy recommendations, especially regarding the obstacles and solutions when implementing these models in different countries or regions?

Reply: Changes done. Details have been added.

5. Overall Structure and Logic: Suggestions: Transitions between sections could be enhanced. For example, when introducing each method, a brief summary of the previous section would strengthen the overall coherence. The conclusion could be expanded to discuss the practical applications of this integrated care model and its potential long-term impact.

Reply: Changes done.

6. Language and Expression: Suggestions: Some sentences could be further refined. For instance, some paragraphs seem a bit lengthy in terms of detail and could benefit from removing unnecessary repetition to enhance the flow of the article.

Reply: Changes done.

7. References: Suggestions: Some references are a bit general. It would be helpful to cite more specific studies or cases in key sections to provide stronger empirical support. Please include the following references in the article.

Reply: Changes done. Added.

8. Conclusion: Suggestions: The conclusion could include a brief discussion on future research directions, such as how the effectiveness and feasibility of this model can be further verified, or a call for more interdisciplinary collaboration.

Reply: Changes done. Added.

Reviewer 3:

“The authors are advised to further elaborate on how these ideas can be realized in practice, as well as expected challenges and solutions.”

Reply: Changes done. Added.

“The format and structure of the article are clear, but it is suggested that subheadings be added in some parts to help readers better follow the logical flow of the article.”

Reply: Changes done. Added.

“Overall, this article provides valuable insights for the field of cancer treatment and proposes a promising integrated model. By further refining implementation details and providing more supportive data, the impact and practicality of the article will be enhanced.”

Reply: Changes done. Added.