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Reviewer's report:

The authors studied 124 patients who underwent surgery for IPMN in a 10-year period and conclude that surgery should only be indicated when 3 relative criteria for resection are positive and to include the type of surgery required in the decision-making algorithm.

I have several comments which I have listed as minor (typos, style) or major (potential bias, major concern) in the order wherein they appear in the manuscript.

1. Abstract, conclusion: this conclusion is rather strong, many patients with 1 or 2 positive criteria may already have pancreatic cancer or develop this in the future. With this study design this cannot be excluded or quantified. Would soften the conclusion considerably. In my observation, the major finding of this work is the strong PPV and NPV for the absolute criteria for resection.(major)

2. General: would suggest "pancreatoduodenectomy" as this is the more commonly used term.(minor)

3. Results: the 15% morbidity rate would be among the lowest in literature ever as this number is typically between 35-55%. Did this include pancreatic fistula, delayed gastric emptying, hemorrhage, etc all B or C?(major)

4. Discussion: would strongly suggest to add a paragraph with shortcomings of this study incl suggestions for future research.(major)
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