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Reviewer's report:

Well written article with logical structure. The authors scientifically analyse a question which in our mind has an obvious answer: More practice and good supervision improves outcomes. This has been done in a diligent way analysing in excess of 1000 pancreatic resection over a 20 year period.

A few points I would suggest would benefit of clarification/mentioning:

- In hospital mortality is not an ideal primary outcome parameter, 60 day mortality would be much preferable

- I do not agree with the conclusion that these data supports centralisation of cases. It only looks at the individual surgeons outcomes not the performance of the entire hospital system, especially given in hospital mortality was chosen as primary outcome.

- Article would benefit from discussion some limitations for the article: retrospective data, changes/recency of practice over 20y period, selection bias of cases (novice vs expert) etc
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