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Reviewer’s report:

1. This retrospective study is conducted for comparing median progression-free survival and median overall survival of untreated characterised KRAS exon 2 wild-type metastatic colorectal cancer in Chinese post-menopause women using therapy with capecitabine plus bevacizumab and capecitabine. The study is well designed, and the manuscript is written comprehensively, however, I think this study is lacking of novelty because 4 previous studies have shown positive results (Alfonso PG, 2013; Alfonso PG, 2012; Amin M, 2015; Bazarbashi S, 2011). The only difference is that this study emphasized on Chinese post-menopause women, however, in your article, the reason is not clearly explained. Would you please give more explanation?

2. Do you consider to put the statement of lacking of generalisability in the limitation part of your manuscript?

3. How do you decide the sample sizes in this study? Do you think the patient number is adequate in each arm?

4. Do you compare underlying disease of these two groups? Because underlying disease may play a role of confounding factor in these two groups.

5. In table 3, the first letter of "progression-free survival rate" should be capitalized.

6. Do you use STROBE checklist for your study design?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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