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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions: None

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. Several spelling/grammatical errors: paragraph 1 of Methods "evolved" should be changed to "involved," Methods under "surgery and post operative treatment" section 1st paragraph "acknowledged" is misspelled, same paragraph, "mascular" should be changed to "vascular," capitalize "three" in the last sentence of the Complications and Toxicities section of the Results section, "correlated" is misspelled in the last sentence of the first paragraph of the "Response to neoadjuvant therapy correlated with decreased scope..." section of the Results. In the same paragraph "evolvement" should be changed to "involvement." Please spell out the number 9 in the second to last paragraph of the Discussion section. The last sentence of the same paragraph the first word, "this," should be capitalized and also need the reference inserted. In the second to last sentence of this same paragraph "compare" should be "compared."

2. The 5th sentence of the first paragraph in the "Response to neoadjuvant therapy correlated with decreased scope of surgery..." section of Results is very confusing and a run on sentence. Specifically, the portion after the semicolon should be made a separate sentence and reworded. The syntax is incorrect for describing the patients that presented with vascular involvement and should be rewritten.

3. In the same paragraph, the last sentence is editorial, not based on data and should not be in the results section. I would recommend moving to discussion section and giving some supporting evidence of WHY they believed neoadjuvant therapy correlated with R1 resection. I am not aware of any data presented here that supports that conclusion. Alternatively, that portion of the sentence could just be removed.

4. In the first sentence of the 4th paragraph of the Discussion section "clinically benefit" is not proper syntax. Please revise.

5. In tables 2, 3, and 4 I would recommend moving "5-year" into the the Table Legend so that they read "Univariate and Multivariate analysis of variable factors for 5-year DSS/LRFS/MFS." It is confusing listed between the "factors" and "univariate/multivariate analysis" as currently presented.
Discretionary Revisions

1. In describing the grading system of surgical complications in the second to last paragraph of the Methods section it may be worth adding the number to the mentioned complication similar to the way it was done when describing the Functional Evaluation System: i.e. "...that requires a bedside debridement of wound (1) to death (5).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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