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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors investigated the safety and efficacy of gemcitabine plus nedaplatin with concurrent chemoradiotherapy for head neck squamous cell carcinoma. The study is well conducted and the methods used are appropriate. I have following concerns.  

(1) I think it is appropriate to submit this article to the journal on head and neck cancer or oncology because this study included only two cases of cervical esophageal cancer and most of the description is related to head and neck cancer.  

(2) Please describe the radiation therapy regimen for 4 patients who have received radiation therapy in the past. Did you change the radiation dose or fields?  

(3) A total of 4 patients who received this chemoradiotherapy died from oral and nasal hemorrhage. Please cite previous reports on the frequency of deaths from hemorrhage in other chemoradiotherapy regimens and compare them to the frequency of deaths in this regimen.
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1. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes

2. Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes

3. Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes

4. Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes

5. Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes

6. Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes

7. Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper’s scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes

8. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes

9. Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes

10. Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes

11. References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes

12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes

13. Research
methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes