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Reviewer’s report:

Wiaaert et al. present an interesting study protocol, but this paper should be revised with regard to some of the content.

Abstract

1. page 2, in the Methods/design, is "Oxaliplatin-based" a mistake of "oxaliplatin-based"?

Background

2. page 4, Reference 10 is cited in the sentence of "In the CAIRO 2 study, which…". Is this a mistake?

Methods/Design

3. page 9, in the paragraph of Study Objectives and Endpoints, why do the authors select IPC, not HIPEC?

4. page 9, in the paragraph of Study Objectives and Endpoints, why is the definition of PFS from date of surgery to disease progression or death, not from date of starting neoadjuvant chemotherapy to disease progression or death? Neoadjuvant chemotherapy is not the protocol treatment? Also about the definition of OS.

6. page 11, in the paragraph of Response assessment, why are patients with clinical signs or symptoms of disease progression excluded?

7. page 12, in the paragraph of Surgery and Chemoperfusion, the authors wrote, "Oxaliplatin (200-460 mg/m2) in dextrose 5% (2 liter/m2) is administered IP…". Why is oxaliplatin not a constant dose?

8. page 13, in the paragraph of Follow-up, what is the regimen as adjutant chemotherapy?
9. page 15, in the paragraph of Statistical considerations, the authors wrote, "Thirty-day morbidity and mortality rates…", and based on the literature, the authors determined the sample size. Why was the sample size determined based on the three-month morbidity and mortality rates, which is the primary endpoint?

10. page 15, in the paragraph of Statistical considerations, the authors wrote, "…, an interim analysis is planned after each cohort of 10 patients is included in the study". What kind of group does each cohort of 10 patients point to?

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

No

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

Unable to assess

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

No

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

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.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal