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Reviewer’s report:

Dear colleagues,

your article has improved over the earlier version and questions have been answered.

Still, may I ask to revise it for a second time.

Major Compulsory Revisions.
This is a small series, thus I would stick as much as possible to your data.
Please review the text in this sense and phrase conclusions more cautiously.

In my view your study shows that Xelox-Bev can be given in a selected population of elderly, fit patients, but maybe toxicity was kind of a concern.
I think that no conclusions can be drawn beyond this.
Could you provide data on RAS/BRAF status?
How many patients received second-line treatment?

Discretionary Revisions:
To me, personally the text seems lengthy now, and some information redundant. Please shorten.
E.g., I felt the info on capecitabine pharmacodynamics too lengthy and also general remarks on CRC.

My main problem is that you cite a large number of trials, which included different populations (in the past) to discuss many different aspects: Efficacy, toxicity, safety. E.g. page 18: You cite FIRE/CALBG saying that OS was longer, but the info that this is a different population (age, RAS status, surgery/resection rate) is missing.
I got lost with this.
Could you regroup, delete or rephrase?

My suggestion:
1) Provide a table of all trials you discuss in your paper, to summarize key trial details, e.g. patient age + PS, intervention, RR/PFS/OS, AEs.
2) reorganize your paper: discuss outcome (against PS, age, chemo used), tox
While I had myself asked for recommendations of how to monitor for cerebral vascular events, I feel your suggestions now a bit strong on wording. E.g.:
From our experience, we propose to monitor neurological signs on each visit and perform cerebral imaging on low threshold in symptomatic patients.
But, this is only a suggestion.
I might have overread it, but please state if response rate assessment was done locally, or by central review.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.