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Reviewer's report:

In the publication "Surgical-only treatment of pancreatic and extra-pancreatic metastases from renal cell carcinoma - quality of life and survival analysis" by Stefania Brozzetti, Antonio V. Sterpetti, Nelide De Lio, Simone Bini, Carlo Lombardi, and Ugo Boggi, the authors report QoL analyses from patients after pancreas resections due to pancreatic RCC metastasis. The authors find that despite a lack of significant differences in survival between surgery and lifelong target-therapy in RCC's pancreatic metastases with or without extra-pancreatic lesions, surgery leads to a better QoL and cost-effectiveness benefits.

The study is well designed, the manuscript is well prepared and nicely written. The additional information on QoL to typical survival data makes this trial exceptional. The study is of retrospective nature and the authors appropriately addressed this limitation in their manuscript. The study shows low complication rate and no mortality.

Minor comments:
The authors report no laparoscopic pancreas resections in their cohort. Since this is standard in many locations the authors should comment on that.
The rate of 50% pancreatectomies appears to be high. The authors should work up and comment on the indications for pancreatectomies. Were there differences in QoL of patients after pancreatectomie and pancreas resections?
It would be worth mentioning if patients received surgery only or further therapies (ablation, radiotherapy or targeted therapies) in their latter course of treatment. Did it affect QoL?

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.

Yes

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:
Acceptable
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