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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. A series of patients treated for non-small cell lung cancer is described. The authors should specify exactly how these patients were selected; were they all patients with this stage of NSCLC of this stage treated at their institutions(s) within a certain period of time? If not, how were they selected? Which patients treated during that period were not included and for what reasons?
2. Was the treatment stopped for patients with progression of disease? The authors imply but do not specify that this was done.
3. For which patients was the treatment continued past 3 cycles? For those with CR or PR, or alternatively, for those whose disease did not progress by cycle 3? This is not explicitly stated but it should be.
4. On the last line of page 3 the authors state that this regimen is "equally active as the prior 3 weekly regimens". The data presented do not support such a statement. I believe that they actually mean that their regimen is comparably active to regimens given every 3 weeks; if so, the sentence should be changed to reflect this.
5. On page 10, line 12, the authors state that "these results also seem better than three weekly schedule of the same drugs". Instead of "better" the authors should define exactly what they claim; do the results seem more effective, less toxic, etc.?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

1. On page 3, line 5, the term "eligible patients" is used. What this means is not clear. Do the authors mean patients with stage III and IV NSCLC who received this treatment regimen? A clearer description should be used.
2. The term "three weekly regimen" is used several times in the manuscript. This is not usual English usage. Something like "a regimen given every three weeks" would probably be better understood.
3. On page 9, line 15, "dose" should be "doses".
4. In table 3, on line 5 of the table, there is a typo; the correct term is asthenia.
5. In table 4, the OS figures for "Response after 3 cycles of CT" are off by one line; I believe that each number should be one line lower.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions
**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No
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