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Reviewer’s report:

XU et al have revised their manuscript and it is significantly approved.

Several comments remain.

Line 4 paragraph 2 of introduction." In one analysis......." Makes little sense to say an agent good in GI cancer would be beneficial in HGG.

Poor grammar line 7 3rd paragraph of introduction " When Bev......"

Might comment on the toxicities seen, particularly bleeding, etc.

The manuscript and discussion leaves a reader thinking that Bev + CPT is an effective combination, yet single agent data exists suggesting single agent is as good--this might be emphasized a bit more.

Paragraph 8 in discussion line 3 sentence is unclear. "This question...."

Last line also poos choice of words, The final answer...."
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