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1. The combined analysis of LUX-LUNG 3 and LUX-LUNG 6 showed that cisplatin plus pemetrexed chemotherapy was more effective in patients with EGFR-L858R mutation than those with EGFR-Del 19 mutation (median overall survivals, 26.9 months versus 20.7 months). The current study, however, showed no difference in overall survival between patients with EGFR-L858R mutation and those with EGFR-Del 19 mutation, although the progression-free survival was better in patients with EGFR-L858R mutation than those with EGFR-Del 19 mutation. Thus, the results of this study do not support the results of the combined analysis of LUX-LUNG 3 and LUX-LUNG 6. The authors should refer to this point in the discussion.

2. Since the results of this study do not support the results of the combined analysis of LUX-LUNG 3 and LUX-LUNG 6, the reviewer recommended to revise or delete the description of the combined analysis in the background section of the abstract.

3. Proliferation abilities of cells with EGFR-wild type, Del-19, and L858R mutations can explain the longer PFS of L858R tumor, but cannot explain the efficacy of chemotherapy.

4. This is a small retrospective study, and therefore, the conclusion should be weakened.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
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