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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS: OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)? Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective? No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results? No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate? Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated? Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound? Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: GENERAL COMMENTS: The study aims to be a meta-analysis/systematic review of laparoscopic v open Pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD) in PDAC. The paper summarizes a number of recent (n=8, 2014-2018) studies and makes the conclusion that LPD is equivalent to OPD in terms of OS with some evidence for some better clinical outcomes ie fistula, bleeding, RO, LNs and reduced LOS. However, the authors have not described in detail the studies included and are not adding any new findings to the published literature.

REQUESTED REVISIONS: The following are a number of suggestions: 1. There are minor grammatical errors and typos throughout the manuscript, please double check eg respective instead of retrospective. 2. State what known variables are known to influence outcome (oncological, mortality and morbidity) in PDAC. 3. In methods expand in figure why studies were excluded. 4. Provide more detail on the studies included eg use of neoadjuvant, histology (if available) capturing tumor size, number of nodes, differentiation, BMI, stented/not. If data not available please state, then in conclusion highlight as a limitation to the analysis. 5. The discussion needs to expand on the limitations of this type of analysis and on how it maybe skewed as certain cases are selected for LPD over OPD.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

Yes

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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