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Reviewer's report:

The Authors reported a retrospective study of 124 patients affected by IPMNs who underwent radical surgery. The aim of this study was to validate the absolute and relative criteria for IPMN management, established by the European Consensus 2018. The Authors concluded that the absolute and relative criteria for IPMN malignancy shows that jaundice, cyst(s) ≥4 cm, and Wirsung duct diameter ≥10 mm are the most predictive absolute criteria of malignancy. Conversely, the diagnostic value of each isolated relative criterion is poor, and combining three relative criteria appears more relevant.

The paper is well-written and it seems original for their interesting conclusions. However, I have some comments:

1-this study includes only a surgical cohort of patients. This is a limitation of the study, because we have no comparison with patients who did not undergo surgery and were surveilled. I suggest to underline this limitation in the text (highly selected population);

2-It will be interesting to know what is the outcome of the patients surveilled, if you know;

3-table 1 and 2. I suggest to add "other resections" as third column for a better comprehension of the table. P value could be useful.

4-Figure 1 is of poor quality

5- there are other articles about the arguments that well described the morphological/clinical characteristics predictive of malignancy.
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