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Reviewer's report:

This is a retrospective report of a treatment regimen for hypopharyngeal cancer. All patients had resectable disease. The therapy regimens were IMRT radiation + Cisplatin/5FU different doses. There are different tumor stages.

The paper lacks of the fact that this is only a retrospective case description without character of a trial. So the comparison of the data with published randomized trials is difficult or better spoken not possible.

Interestingly early and late toxicity was high. 26% of patients received tracheotomy due to stridor (we don not know about the reversibility of the tracheotomies). One patient died 10 months after therapy.

All together the paper gives some ideas of IMRT in organ preservation but some information is missing. Authors should not focus on comparison to randomized trials. The should give more attention to feasibility and toxicity. Functional outcome should be described much more comprehensive.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? The question is well defined but incomplete
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? yes
3. Are the data sound? If the data are described more comprehensive, long term outcome after this new regimen would be interesting.
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? no
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? no
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? no
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? no
9. Is the writing acceptable? yes

To conclude, major revisions are needed. The authors should focus more on the definitive results of their treatment regarding feasibility, toxicity and functional outcome.
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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