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Reviewer's report:

The study design was rational, and regimen selection and grouping were appropriate. Clinical data was reliable with proper statistical method used. The article title and abstract well described the content of their research. Their conclusions were objective and their reference citations were reasonable.

Several details need to clarify before publication:

1. Drug dosage and administration methods should be described in more detail
   # Four cisplatin-based regimens were used in this study. The paper showed the cisplatin dosage from 60 to 100mg/m2. The dosage of cisplatin in each study group and the reasoning for dose adjustment should be provided.
   # In FP regimen, the method of 5-Fu administration was iv, either bolus intravenous injection or continuous intravenous infusion should be specified.

2. The criteria on the efficacy evaluation needed
   # RECIST criteria was used for assessment of therapeutic efficacy. The study only mentioned the use of abdominal pelvic CT and other methods. Please describe whether it was spiral CT and specify what other methods are.
   # Regarding to CR and PR patients, a confirmation evaluation after one month should be mentioned.
   # Please indicate whether the therapeutic efficacy were evaluated by imaging experts?
   # In each study group, the total response rate was available. Additional information about CR and PR rate should be provided.

3. The results show that performance status (ECOG 0-1 VS # 2) and peritoneal metastasis were prognostic factors associated with objective response rate, PFS and OS. The following questions need to address:
   # According to Table 1 shows: ECOG # 2 patients in SP, DP and FP were 2-3 times more than XP group (only 5% in XP group). Considering baseline characteristic imbalanced in each group, how to interpret the results. XP group with more ECOG 0-1 patients could be the cause of high response rate.
   # According to Table 1: 75% patients in FP group were found peritoneal metastasis, which was 1.38-1.6 times higher than XP, SP or DP groups. Imbalance in baseline characteristic in each group, how to interpret the results?
   # Since the baseline characteristic of FP and XP groups were comparable, the
differences of PFS, OS (including the survival curve) and toxicity in these two
group were warranted further statistical analysis.

4. Adverse events

# Please indicate the criteria for toxicity evaluation.

# Table 2 only showed that the overall incidence of grade 3-4 toxicity was not
significantly different among four groups. The hematological toxicity and
non-hematological toxicity should be separated for analysis. In addition, grade
3-4 toxicity in FP group appeared lower than other groups. Any interpretation
from this observation?

5. Please indicate the title of Figure 1 and the definition of the vertical axis.

Further review is required after revision.

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.