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Reviewer’s report:

The cohort is quite large with 49 patients and is one of the largest series. However, major revisions should be made:

- This is a descriptive study without comparison with standart pancreatosplenectomy. Hence, the most important data should be morbidity and histopathological analysis. The authors should present results on margins and lymph nodes involvement in the abstract. Even if no comparison in the authors' centre can be performed, the authors may add a table with review of the literature with the main results (survival, R1, lymph nodes) of other published series of RAMPS and standart pancreatosplenectomy.

- Could the authors add references to "complete resection with lymph node dissection is essential for cure" and "left to right pancreatosplenectomy is associated with a high rate of tangential margin positivity" in the introduction?

- Some recent references about RAMPS are missing

- Table 1 is not useful as everything it contains is in the main text

- Regarding the survival cure, it should be interrupted at 9 patients at risk

- Regarding recurrences, i understand there has been 6 locoregional recurrences. The authors report 11 lymph nodes recurrences: where were these lymph nodes situated?
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