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**Reviewer’s report:**

The question posed by the authors is well defined and it is outstanding. Authors do not say if it is a phase II randomized or a phase III study. They do not describe the sample size calculation method. They mixed glioma grade III and grade IV.

The groups are not well balanced for two important prognostic variables as KPS (KPS < or = 70 39% in control arm vs. 15% in study arm) or debulking surgery (Total 5% in control arm vs. 17% in study arm). This can strongly influence in the results.

The recruitment was very long (5 years).

They should say why the number of patients between arms is quite different (39 vs. 31) when the randomization was 1:1

Results shown important differences when the authors analyze AA and GBM separately. Results are better for AA than GBM and authors should reflect this in the discussion and added figures of OS by histology and analyze if OS is statistically significant in GBM.

Authors should say how many patients were evaluable for response by each arm

I suggest added a table of toxicities

Authors should include statistically significant differences in the abstract.

Part of the background may be translated to discussion, especially previous experiences of German, Stupp and Hegi trials.

The title and abstract accurately convey what has been found

The writing is acceptable

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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