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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is a very nice retrospective study comparing PDAC that have arisen from two different parts of the pancreas. It is well organized and the data well presented. There is need of only a careful correction of English as it is a bit stilited in some parts and this makes the reading not a smooth as it could be. I would like to see the discussion about why their data suggests that Gemcitabine treatment would be better in tumors arising from the PBTC rather than the PHC. Also, lease explain better why the SMAD mutations were not statistically significant while those of p53 were. Probably due to very large variation in the data even if SMAD was mutated 3 times higher in the PHC. Otherwise, it is fine as it is and can be published after those English corrections and maybe the explainations of the data and conclusions.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is an interesting retrospective analysis to explore the impact of pancreatic tumor location on presentations and molecular profiles of the patients. The following problems need to be improved. 1. As a retrospective analysis, the size of the cohort was limited. 2. Please specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the case. 3. More clinical parameters need to be added, including differentiation level, family history, smoking status, CA199 level, molecular typing, etc. 4. In Response to Chemotherapy, the post-treatment evaluation of CR, PR, SD and PD after chemotherapy should be introduced.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
With pleasure, I reviewed the article entitled: “Pancreatic head versus pancreatic body/tail cancer: are they different?” by the authors Kai Sun et al. The authors present a retrospective genetic analysis in which pancreatic head tumours and pancreatic body/tail tumours are compared. This is an interesting topic and genetic analysis will certainly be explored further in the future. The manuscript is well-written and the authors need to be acknowledged for all the work. I also have some comments. 1. The number of patients in which genetic analysis is performed ultimately is relatively small. Furthermore, the analysis is done on several tissues. It is unclear how patients were selected and it makes it difficult to making to translate these findings to clinical practice. The authors should provide somewhat more information on this. Also, more information is needed on differences in genetic analysis is various tissues. 2. The Material and Methods section is succinct, but also lacks important information. What were eligibility criteria? Information on how data was collected, informed consent of the patients etc should be included. Also data on chemotherapy schemes etc would be insightful. Minor comments 1. The title should be more specific. 2. Are the differences in survival corrected for stage?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, thank you for answering the comments made. I agree with the additions and have no further comments.