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Reviewer’s report:

This is a study aimed to analyze the outcomes of laparoscopic distal pancreatectomy for pancreatic adenocarcinoma, compared with open approach. It’s a case-matched retrospective study including 45 patients. It’s an interesting work, for the limited data in literature, but I have the following criticisms.

1-More informations about the design of the study and patient selection are required. Why did you choose this type of study?

Concerning exclusion criteria for LDP, how many patients were excluded on the basis of these criteria? You report that 17 LDPs were performed including 2 conversion that were excluded, so finally 15 LDP cases were enrolled in the study. After in the discussion you write “we excluded patients who underwent LDP, with tumor size >5 cm in body and >10 cm in tail of the pancreas”.

There were exclusion/inclusion criteria for ODP? What about ODP not included in the study (21 cases)?

2- Method: the “operative technique” section is too long and detailed and it can be lightened. Conversely in the section “definition of outcomes”, a brief description of Clavien-Dindo classification and of the grading of postoperative pancreatic fistula would be appropriate. In the “patients follow-up” section, “All patients were regularly followed up” is too vague; please be more precise.

3- Result: in the fourth sentence of “Comparison of surgical outcome for PDAC” there is an error. You report “the first flatus time and diet start time were shorter in LDP group 2.67+0.8d vs 3.8+0.1d, P=0.000...” while first oral intake showed no significant differences between the two groups (p=0.183)

In “survival” section more result about adjuvant treatment are needed: you can move it there from the last part of the discussion.

4-Tables and figures: tables are not self-explaining. Please add log rank test p-value in figures.

MINOR ISSUES NOT FOR PUBLICATION:

Abstract (background)
Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma: you used both “PDCA” or “PDAC” as abbreviation.
Abstract (method)
“30 patients were underwent”: probably it is “30 patients who underwent”.

Abstract (results)
Concerning first flatus values “2.67±0.816d vs 3.83±0.950d, P=0.000”: change “+” with “±” and add p value.

Key words
Please add “surgery” or “access” after the key word “open”.

Introduction
- Remove the point between “oncologic safety” and the reference 4.
- I think that you had to report the extent form of the abbreviations (LDP, ODP and PDAC), and correct “PDCA” with “PDAC” in the last phrase.

Method
Patient sample and data collection
- Please report in this section the extent form of ASA and BMI.
- The last part of this paragraph (the description of collected data) is a bit confused: i.e you wrote “…postoperative complications, the postoperative pancreatic fistulae….”, but the fistula is itself a complication; furthermore you can put “tumor size” near “tumor grade, tumor stage…” and change “R0 resection” with “resection margin status”.

Results
Baseline characteristic
-You had to remove from this section the extent form of ASA and BMI and add the extent form of “DM”.

Comparision of surgical outcomes for PDAC
- In the second paragraph of the section, please add “resection” between “partial” and “portal vein”.
- In the last sentence of this section you can change “one mortality” with “one death”.

Comparision of Clinicopathologic Characteristic
I think that you can use lowercase letters for “Clinicopathologic Characteristic” in the title and in the first phrase of the paragraph.

Survival
In the first phrase move “for ODP group” before “21.7 months and 14.0 months”.

Discussion
Please add the extent form of “SMA” in the middle of this section
Table 2: p-value of first flatus time is wrong.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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