Reviewer’s report

Title: Preoperative chemotherapy and carbon ions therapy for treatment of resectable and borderline resectable pancreatic adenocarcinoma: a prospective, phase II, multicentre, single-arm study

Version: 0 Date: 26 Jun 2019

Reviewer: Masashi Kanai

Reviewer’s report:

This is a manuscript introducing the ongoing trial evaluating the efficacy of preoperative chemotherapy using FOLFIRINOX followed by carbon ions radiotherapy for resectable or borderline resectable pancreatic cancer. The accrual has already started and six patients are enrolled so far.

This reviewer has some comments as below.

1. In introduction, authors described that gemcitabine combination therapy including gem+CDDP and gem+oxaliplatin seem to work better than gem monotherapy; however, a randomized phase III trials failed to demonstrate the superiority of gem+CDDP or gem+oxaliplatin over gem monotherapy in palliative setting. So this description could mislead the readers.

2. DPD enzyme activity is included in the eligibility criteria. How do you measure DPD enzyme activity?

3. It is difficult for this reviewer to understand the following two conflicting sentences.

A. "All enrolled patients will be evaluated for the efficacy endpoints (ITT populations) (P11. line4)"

B. "Subjects meeting the enrollment criteria but eventually declining to participate in the study will serve as controls. (P11, line 7-9)"

If all enrolled patients will be evaluated for the efficacy on the basis of ITT analysis, no patients will serve as controls.
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.

No

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

Unable to assess

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:
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