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Reviewer's report:

I like the idea - the extrapolation from FL's use in other malignancies is a logical step. I am concerned regarding the tiny number of cases used in the report. Helpful in 2 out of 7 cases isn't really a viable conclusion although I accept that the authors recognise the need for further studies. Even as a pilot I would like to see some sort of power calculation for the numbers that might be required to evaluate whether this is really helpful. Parotid surgery isn't that uncommon that more cases wouldn't be available. Perhaps some comments relating to this in the manuscript would be helpful.

I would also like to know whether microscope use is standard practice for the operating surgeons. If it isn't then even just the use of the microscope will enhance the view in which case the only relevant question to be asked is 'Can you see the tumour better?'

There needs to be some discussion around the fact that 1 of the 2 tumours with satellites was a Warthin's tumour so the implications for residual disease is not particularly significant so in fact the FL only helped (perhaps) alter the outcome in 1 patient and even then we cannot be sure because we don't know the implications of leaving satellite nodules behind. They almost certainly don't always cause recurrence.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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