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Reviewer's report:

Re: 'Phase II study of two dose schedules of C.E.R.A. (Continuous Erythropoietin Receptor Activator) in anemic patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) receiving chemotherapy'

Dear Dr Hirsh,

I read your paper entitled 'Phase II study of two dose schedules of C.E.R.A. (Continuous Erythropoietin Receptor Activator) in anemic patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) receiving chemotherapy', assessing efficacy and safety of different dose schedules of C.E.R.A. As you mentioned, higher dose schedules could give more information in terms of both efficacy and safety. Quality of written English in good and the paper is important mostly for those with closely related research interests. However, I am unable to decide on acceptance until you have responded to the major compulsory revisions.

Yours Sincerely
Dr Andrea Mancuso

Re: 'Phase II study of two dose schedules of C.E.R.A. (Continuous Erythropoietin Receptor Activator) in anemic patients with advanced non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) receiving chemotherapy'

Major Compulsory Revision:

1) Overall, the paper is interesting but not of immediate comprehension. A more schematic description is suggested.
2) In the Abstract Results (page 3): it is not understandable which is the best dose between the 6 ones used. Statistical analysis should be reported. Finally, more simple description of the results is suggested.
3) Page 9, Line 18: explain the meaning of “appropriate clinical intervention”.
4) Page 13, Lines 13 – 18: explain the reason of investigator withdrawal and of the site error.
5) Page 13, Line 22: give a reason of a so high number of protocol violations
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.