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Reviewer's report:

Guilbaud et al. present a retrospective analysis of three different feeding regimes after partial pancreaticoduodenectomy. The topic is worth of presenting it and the manuscript is well presented. However, I have some Major concerns which should be addressed prior to a possible publication:

Title:

Please shorten the title and include the study type e.g. "Comparison of different feeding regimes after partial pancreaticoduodenectomy - a retrospective cohort analysis"

Abstract:

Here it says that the aim was only to evaluate DGE. Please state clearly what was the main Goal of the study or just say, that you wanted to analyse the General outcome, which would be perfectly OK for a explorative study.

Please use the same conclusion here as in the manuscript text.

Background:

Here the primary endpoint is postoperative morbidity and mortality. Please harmonise in the whole manuscript.

Methods:

Please state clearly that, despite the prospective database, the study is retrospective as the decision which of the regimes was used was not part of the study. Furthermore, please make this point more clearly: Who decided which regime was used and by what criteria?
You distinguish PPPD from Whipple's procedure. Please state how much of the stomach was resected. If there is only few resected of the stomach you should better refer to the procedure as Longmire-Traverso or simply PRPD (Pylorus-resecting PD).

Reference 35 is outdated; please cite the new one.

Please state at the beginning of the statistics paragraph that you only use descriptive statistics without an "a priori" hypothesis.

Results:

The results are well presented and the complication rates are honestly reported and are in line with literature for medium size centres for pancreatic surgery.

Other than for POPF all grades of DGE are clinically relevant. The Problem in this study may be that all patients fulfill the grade A criteria because they have a tube inserted on POD 7 at the discretion of the treating surgeon. Please state this more clearly in the methods and discussion section, that you therefore only evaluate DGE B/C.

Please re-word: only biological POPF (grade A) to "biochemical leak"

Discussion:


Page 14, line 54: Please also state that there are regimes using a combined enteral-parenteral nutritional Approach e.g. "Probst et al. Early combined parenteral and enteral nutrition for pancreaticoduodenectomy - Retrospective cohort analysis. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2016 Feb 4;6:68-73."

Please add to the conclusion that to answer your question prospective and adequately powered studies will be needed. Use this conclusion in the abstract.
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