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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes. It is clearly stated.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   • From the text and table it is not known that all patients in the study group had temozolamide chemotherapy or have temsirolismus or other. This group could be heterogeneous itself and different treatment methods could bias results.

   Major lacks of this paper is:
   • There is no description of radiotherapy technique (new techniques make treatment of more advance stages possible: 3D, IMRT, Arc, proton).
   • Lack of preoperative staging of patients
   • Performance status analysis which is one of the most important prognostic factors
   • Definition of progression is not given (recist, clinical).

Two groups: study and reference were very heterogeneous. And it is known phenomenon of better efficacy of the treatment in clinical trials due to better selection, clinical and radiological control etc.

My proposal for this topic is to find lacking data shown above, make new comparison in subgroups (PS etc).

It should be interesting to find threshold (or cut-off) delay which determine poorer
survival both in study and reference group as cited below:

Prognostic value of the interval from surgery to initiation of radiation therapy in correlation with some histo-clinical parameters in patients with malignant supratentorial gliomas.
Gliński B1, Urbański J, Hetná M,

3. Are the data sound?
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
Yes but more factors should be shown in tables (performance status, proportion of young age, location of the tumor etc)
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
yes
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes
10. Is the writing acceptable?

Quality of written English
-----------------------------

English is in many parts poor and needs considering and correcting.
For example sentences:
6 Besides new therapeutically approaches, timley treatment initiation has been shown a negative impact on survival rates; this has recently moved back into focus since data from other tumor types have supported this hypothesis, e.g. from breast cancer [3,10] or head and neck cancer [1].
Prospective trials evaluating the relationship between delay and survival are not practicable.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

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