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Dear Editor,

We received the comments of all 3 Reviewers and revised the manuscript, final version of which was also uploaded to the system. We appreciated and would like to thank for the kind re-evaluation and feelings of Reviewer 1 and 3 on our current manuscript. Reviewer 2 criticized our manuscript in several aspects, most of which are proof and editing type errors. We revised our study in that view and performed some minor modifications and additions in order to address all issues suggested, and presented them in a point-by-point manner in the responses to reviewers section below. Finally, revised manuscript was re-evaluated by commercial language editing company namely “Biosciencewriters”, and no further linguistic problem or suggested modifications was reported. We hope we could satisfy suggestions by the Reviewer 2 which we believe that added too much to our current version of manuscript.

Best Regards,

**Attachment**: Response to reviewers

On behalf of all co-authors,

**Erkan TOPKAN, M.D.**

Department of Radiation Oncology,
Baskent University Adana Medical Faculty,
Adana/ Turkey

Phone: +90 322 3228282(1305)
Fax: +90 322 3227979
E-Mail: docdretopkan@gmail.com
Response to Reviewers

Reviewer 1

We appreciate and would like to thank Reviewer 1 for his/her re-evaluation kind feelings on current version of the manuscript.

Reviewer 2

We appreciate and would like to thank Reviewer 2 for his/her worthwhile review and kind comments, which we believe will increase the value of the current revised version of the manuscript.

Comment 1. Abstract - Results section "8.4 versus 3.8" (there is a space missing after 8.4)

Response 1. Regarding the recommendation given by the Reviewer, a space, formerly forgotten by mistake, was added, and the sentence was changed as “Median OS, PFS, and LRPFS for those with greater (N=16) versus lesser (N=16) SUVmax change were 17.0 versus 9.8 (p=0.001), 8.4 versus 3.8 (p=0.005), and 12.3 versus 6.9 months (p=0.02), respectively.”

Comment 2. Methods - 2nd sentence reads awkwardly as patients don't have histologic proof of unresectability... i would suggest something like :32 patients with unresectable, non-metastatic LAPC with histologic proof of malignancy were enrolled...

Response 2. In order to improve the understanding of the readers and to remove any confusion on the manuscript, in the light the suggestion given by the Reviewer, second sentence in the methods section was modified as “Thirty-two patients with unresectable, non-metastatic LAPC with histologic proof of malignancy were prospectively enrolled”.

Comment 3. "biops(y)ies" can probably be written as "biopsies"
Response 3. Regarding the recommendation given by the Reviewer, the word was changed the new sentence is as follows “All eligible patients underwent laparoscopic or laparotomic examination and biopsies for histologic diagnosis of primary tumor and enlarged/metabolically active regional lymph nodes and isolated single organ metastasis respecting the current standard institutional staging procedure for pancreatic carcinoma.”

Comment 4. "Results - 2nd paragraph "26 patients experienced some failure during the disease course" should be re-written as "26 pts experienced some failure during the follow-up period"

Response 4. The stated sentence was revised as recommended and replaced by “Twenty-six patients (81.3%) experienced some failure during the follow-up period.”

Comment 5. Results - last sentence - i’d add the median OS for those with who went on to resection, but that is just because as a reader i wanted to know.

Response 5. Respecting the recommendation by the Reviewer, which we believe increase the value of our study, survival data of the 6 resected patients were re-checked and decided to be presented in the current version of manuscript. To provide the survival data of these cases, the last sentence in the previous manuscript was changed as “At the time of this analysis, 4 of the 6 resected patients (66.7%) were still alive at 18.8, 20.4, 25.8, and 34.3 months of follow-up, while remaining two patients were lost due to widespread disease progression at 18.0 and 20.2 months, respectively.”

Comment 6. Results - last sentence - i’d add the median OS for those with who went on to resection, but that is just because as a reader i wanted to know.
Response 6. Respecting the recommendation by the Reviewer, which we believe increase the value of our study, survival data of the 6 resected patients were re-checked and decided to be presented in the current version of manuscript. To provide the survival data of these cases, the last sentence in the previous manuscript was changed as “At the time of this analysis, 4 of the 6 resected patients (66.7%) were still alive at 18.8, 20.4, 25.8, and 34.3 months of follow-up, while remaining two patients were lost due to widespread disease progression at 18.0 and 20.2 months, respectively.”

Comment 7. I'm pretty sure Reference 44 has been published (within the last 2 months or so).

Response 7. As stated by reviewer, the Reference 44, which was formerly written as EPUB-ahead of publication, was published in September 1. Thus, the reference 44 was re-written with its available publication details in the current version of the manuscript.

Reviewer 3

We appreciate and would like to thank Reviewer 1 for his/her re-evaluation kind feelings on current version of the manuscript.