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Reviewer’s report:

This meta-analysis is potentially interesting, since this topic is relatively new. Although the most part of the methodology is well written, there are some important limits in the first part of the study.

Using the following keywords, [(nasal sinus) AND/OR (paranasal sinus)] AND [(cancer)] AND [(odds ratio) OR (relative risk) OR (prevalence ratio) OR (hazard ratio)] – SCOPUS 138 documents, GOOGLE Scholar 6,420 documents. PubMed provided only 70 papers, so it is not possible to say that the majority of observational studies were identified by the Authors.

Histologically, several groups of neoplasms were included: adenocarcinoma, squamous cell carcinoma, anaplastic carcinoma, transitional-cell carcinoma, epidermoid carcinoma, adenoid cystic carcinoma, mucinous adenocarcinoma, anaplastic carcinoma, respiratory cells carcinoma and other histologic subgroups.

With so many forms of cancer, a rationale is necessary that justifies the idea that the effect of the investigated carcinogens is the same for this heterogeneous group of neoplasms. The funnel plots corroborate the hypothesis that studies are discrepant, as the typical shape of funnel is not visible in any of the investigated carcinogens.

If the Authors wish to perform such a complex meta-analysis, they should perform a thorough literature search as above described and to distinguish between different forms of cancer, at least those forms that cannot be considered similar from the histological point of view.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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