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Reviewer’s report:

I would like to thank the authors for a very detailed response to all comments from the reviewers. I believe the updated manuscript to be significantly improved. I still feel the first few paragraphs of the discussion are slightly tangential to the focus of the paper, but that is not a reason to dismiss them.

Below are a few things i noticed re-reading the manuscript. None are concerning:

1) Abstract - Results section "8.4versus 3.8" (there is a space missing after 8.4)
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...
3)Methods - "biops(y)ies" can probably be written as "biopsies"
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"
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
6) Conclusions - there are 2 commas in a row after "And second,, significantly..."
7) I'm pretty sure Reference 44 has been published (within the last 2 months or so)

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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