Reviewer's report

Title: Retrospective analysis of seven cases of pancreatic mixed adenoneuroendocrine carcinoma from a high-volume center and review of the literature

Version: 2 Date: 23 Apr 2019

Reviewer: Riccardo Casadei

Reviewer's report:

The authors reported their experience about pMANEC and reviewed the literature. They described the characteristics of pMANEC and compared pMANEC with PDAC.

I have several comments:

1-Background have to be shorter. Explain what is pMANEC; the existing literature and the aim of the study;

2-Method section is detailed. I suggest to include in this section also the additional file with the aim to obtain a more detailed method section.

3-Definition. Tumor grading have to be revised considering WHO 2017

4-Results. How many preoperative biopsy allowed to do diagnosis of pMANEC? I suggest to remove table 3 and add in table 1, a line with the final/total results. I suggest to add a Figure of DSS (Kaplan-Meier curve) regarding the only parameter significant (LN metastasis). I suggest to reduce figure 1 and 2 to only a case. All these images are not useful.

5-Discussion section is too long. Explain in a short way both the characteristics of the pMANEC and the differences with PDAC.

6-Conclusion clearly stated the characteristics of the pMANEC and their differences with PDAC.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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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.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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