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Reviewer's report:

In their study „Intraductal papillary mucinous neoplasms of the pancreas and European guidelines: importance of the surgery type in the decision-making process”, Buscail et al. performed a retrospective evaluation of the 2018 European guidelines for the treatment of IPMN.

Overall, the manuscript is well written. However several issues should be addressed prior to its publication:

- Minor spelling and grammatical errors should be addressed.

- The time over which the cases were operated on is 10 years (2007-2017) and the oldest cases are thus over 12 years old by now. This should be mentioned as a clear limitation of the study.

- The study only addresses cases that were operated on and had histologically proven IPMN. However, it remains unclear how many cysts were resected under the suspicion of IPMN and turned out to be another entity.

- It remains unclear how many patients were followed-up without surgery and what happened to these cases.

- It remains unclear how many cases did not require surgery in the collective if the criteria were applied.

- In their assessment, the authors should evaluate the validity of the suggested criteria separately for each entity (BD, MD and mixed type-IPMN) instead of focusing on all IPMN. While the indications for surgery for MD and mixed type-IPMN are quite clear, the challenge are BD-IPMN, the entity where the suggested criteria matter the most.

- While not being the primary focus of the study, it would be interesting whether international FUKUOKA criteria are better /worse compared to the European guideline.
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