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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript PHAT-D-18-00204 by Yoshida N et al describes the results of a retrospective, observational study that compared the efficacy of a triple anti-emetic regimen (aprepitant, palonosetron, and dexamethasone) versus the combination of palonosetron and dexamethasone in adult patients with cancer receiving moderately emetogenic chemotherapy.

Main criticism

The main problem of the study is that the patients were not randomly assigned to one of the two anti-emetic regimens and neither was the investigator blinded to the anti-emetic regimen prescribed. This is a serious problem with the study design, which in essence is a retrospective review of patient medical records, something that can certainly introduce bias. Moreover, the patient population was inhomogeneous, since it included patients with colorectal, gastric, lung, and several types of gynecological cancers. To make things worse, there was a significant difference in the median age and primary organ involved with cancer between the two groups of anti-emetics. Finally, although the exclusion criteria are clearly stated, the authors fail to explain in Figure 1, why 134 patients with breast cancer and 50 patients with pancreatic cancer were excluded from further analysis.

Minor criticism

There are several typos and mistakes throughout the manuscript. For example, in line 49, page 9, creatinine is misspelled to creatine, in line 42, page 14, be is misspelled to ne, the units of hemoglobin in Tables 2-4 are incorrect (mg/dl instead of the correct g/dl), etc.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

No competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.