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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript provides an interesting network meta-analysis of 28 clinical trials published over the previous ~30 years to compare approaches for treating hypopharyngeal and laryngeal neoplasms. While the article presents a potentially interesting finding, it is difficult to interpret with the limited analysis that has been completed thus far. For example, information regarding the classification of responses across trials is important to understand with increased clarity. How the outcome of the meta-analysis is being driven by the input data as well as how some of the potentially confounding variables affect the model are not discussed in the context of effect on the model. Some of these variables include cancer type/study, stage distribution of each trial's population and other potentially confounding variables. Overall, the conclusion is too strongly stated given the limited depth of analysis completed so far.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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