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Reviewer's report:

My major point of criticism is were the 3 groups really comparable in terms of intrahepatic tumor burden and other aspects? I personally do not think so.

In fact when checking at table 1 and 3 I see major discrepancies in terms of tumor location, primary tumor location, T stadium, use of biologic agents, extension of resections.

In other words: the 3 groups are not comparable for me.

You should identify similar groups in a sort of matched pair analysis.

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

-sometimes the sy. CRLM are diagnose few weeks/months after diagnosis of primary CRC.

Which is the max time frame you considered to include CRLM after the diagnosis of primary CRC?

-I am missing the point of when „liver first“ at your center. In fact it seems you resected the primary first and the CRLM afterwards with/without CTx inbetween.

-What about technical aspects? standard liver resction? any augmentation procedures? i.e. PVE or ALPPS? Laparoscoipcvs open?
- Regarding CTx treatment: any side effects? (e.g. NAFLD after CTx?). How many patients got molecular target therapy (e.g. anti EGFR or similar) What about side effects at this regard?

**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.

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Acceptable
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