

Point by point response to reviewers

Reviewer #1:

1) The limitation of the study is that the clinical information was collected from only 51 patients. This is a small sample size. However, the authors have discussed this limitation in their discussion section and notified the readers. Therefore, it may be fine.

Response:

Since this is a post-hoc analysis of a prospective trial we are not able to get a bigger sample size

Reviewer #2:

1) The only limitation of the study is the size of the sample analyzed. We understand that it is a phase I/II study. But the results provided by the work would be more informative with a higher number of patients.

Response:

Please see response to reviewer #1

Science editor comments

1) According to their published paper (reference 15) Table 1, there were 14 cases with peritoneal metastasis in 53 patients. However, there presented 15 such cases here. Even that, the number is still too small

Response:

We have gone back to the case reports of the prospective trial and confirmed the number of patients with peritoneal metastasis to be 15

2) Figure 1 and 2 are not clear enough for me to appreciate the meaning, it seems to me patients with peritoneal metastasis had better prognosis. What is the Log-rank p value?

Response:

Figure 1 and 2 show no significant difference in PFS and OS for the patients with peritoneal metastasis vs no peritoneal metastasis. We have added the Log-rank p value to both the figure legend.

3) Table 3 is not so relevant to the aim of this study

Response:

We believe it is relevant to the study since peritoneal metastasis was confirmed to be independent prognostic factor in multivariate analysis in previous studies. This was not confirmed in the setting of triplet first line chemotherapy

4) The results, especially in abstract is not clear.

Response:

We have edited and clarified the results of the both the abstract and the text. Please refer to the manuscript with track changes

22 November 2021