

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 69253

Title: First-Line Cisplatin, Docetaxel, and Cetuximab for Patients with Recurrent or Metastatic Head and Neck Cancer: A Multicenter Cohort Study

Reviewer's code: 03002093

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Hungary

Author's Country/Territory: Argentina

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-06 05:31

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-07 13:42

Review time: 1 Day and 8 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major As a single arm investigation of very few patients it does not give any new information even if it was a multicentric study. Very recently, a comparison of TPEx and EXTREME was published (it should be cited). How do you explain that your ORR was >10% better than that of others'? The frequency of grade 3/4 events was also very low. Presumably, it was a very selected group of patients (private care centers - with unusual, unrevealed premedications, etc.) rather than a real-world study. Why the PFS was not tested for the other variables (similarly to the type of response)? I suggest to reinvestigate PFS at least according to dose changes, tumor site, metastatic vs. advanced, previous treatments, AEs. Moreover, the median follow-up will be longer and the OS can also be reevaluated (e.g. according to the type of immunotherapy). Try to find out what were the characteristics of a real-world treatment cohort, which differed compared to trials. I could not find the institutional ethical approvals for this investigation.

Minor Table 1: p16 can be omitted. Table 3: report separately grade 3 and 4. Fig. 1-3: use dot for decimal numbers at y axis. For better comparison of TPEx trials make a table.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Oncology

Manuscript NO: 69253

Title: First-Line Cisplatin, Docetaxel, and Cetuximab for Patients with Recurrent or Metastatic Head and Neck Cancer: A Multicenter Cohort Study

Reviewer's code: 03002093

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Hungary

Author's Country/Territory: Argentina

Manuscript submission date: 2021-06-22

Reviewer chosen by: Ya-Juan Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-09-07 12:51

Reviewer performed review: 2021-09-08 06:57

Review time: 18 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I accept your responses, except that about ethical approval. 1. The ethical approval should be included into the text, which I had not found. 2. I don't know what the requirements for multicentre testing are in your country, but you will probably need to get the approval of the national committee. Ethical approval of a single institution is not enough.