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Reviewer's report:

The Authors presented a very interesting paper dealing with the role of the updated European Consensus guidelines (2018) in the management of intraductal mucinous neoplasms of the pancreas (IPMN).

They analysed the specificity, sensitivity and predictive values of absolute and relative criteria for surgery of the recent European consensus; the diagnostic performance of CT, MRCP and EUS in detecting malignancy in IPMN; and the postoperative outcomes of a series of 124 consecutive IPMN treated with surgical resection.

I have some questions for the authors:

1. The Authors reported a 50% rate of resected benign tumors (low grade or intermediate dysplasia, 63.5% of resected branch duct IPMN): which was the indication for surgical resection in this proportion of patients (symptomatic patients; worrisome or high risk stigmata at preoperative imaging)? Was surveillance considered in the absence of symptoms or radiological suspicious features? It should have been great to have a control group of patients not undergoing surgery but followed up...

2. When considering the diagnostic performance of preoperative work-up examinations, EUS is reported as less accurate (in comparison with CT and MRCP) in both BD and MD or mixed IPMN. However, EUS was performed in 55% of branch duct IPMN only, and in 52% of main duct/mixed type IPMN only. Which is the Author's policy in including EUS in the initial work-up of IPMN?
3. Finally, among the 2018 European guidelines criteria for resection, the role of positive cytology for malignant/high grade dysplasia was not analysed (due too many missing data). EUS/FNA was performed respectively in 43% and 51% of cases: did cytology play a role in the decision making in this proportion of patients? In which proportion of malignant IPMN, was preoperative cytology positive?

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

Yes

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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