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Reviewer's report:

From a cancer epidemiology standpoint, this trial was well planned but reporting may be improved.

- since you reported survival results at two different updates, you should cite the correspondent median(range) follow-up and not only its median; the same for age in table 1

- "If an insufficient number of 158 responses was observed after Stage 1 or Stage 2, the study would progress to Part 3" normally, using Simon design, when you get few responses, the study will be stopped; you did the opposite, please clarify why and how

- the title should reflect which part of your trial is now presented

- RECIST 1.0, why not v. 1.1?

- CTC 3.0, why not 4.0-1?

- "correlation with clinical outcomes" please use potential association, not correlation (all around the manuscript)

- 0%CR + 35%PR + 22%SD + 16%PD = 73% + 28% not assessable = 101% (mind table 2)

- "Results from this phase II study in Chinese patients are positive" I don't agree, see above

- "The nab-paclitaxel/gemcitabine regimen used in MPACT was efficacious" I don't agree, see above

- table 4 is not a comparison (since no inferential test was done), it's a mere report

- poor figures quality, moreover figure 2 should be omitted (no play for NLR)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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