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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The concept presented here is very interesting. The analysis of the significance of hospital volume and surgeon volume in particular provides an important basis for the discussion. The data will certainly be of interest to our readers. However, a serious mistake must be corrected. The first PD was not carried out by Whipple, but by Walter Kausch 25 years earlier. Kausch W. Das Carcinom der Papilla duodeni und seine radikale Entfernung. Beiträge zur Klinische Chirurgie. 1912;78:439-486.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript showed Whipple’s operation outcomes in low-volume caribbean centers. This paper is interesting. However, it dose not receive a high enough for publication. 1, There are two Table 1 in this paper. Please make renumbering tables 2, Table 1 (Hospital volumes)showed that the perioperative mortality in high-volume centers was high. Is it correct? 3, The authors said that Table 2 outlines the proportion of PDs performed by low-volume hospitals in developed countries. Where were the data of low-volume hospitals in developed countries? 4, Please show the data of Caribbean countries using table. There was weak evidence to support the conclusion in this paper.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
To the Editor: Thanks for giving me the opportunity to revise the manuscript that deals with a topic I am keen on. Particularly, I find it novel and interesting, not in terms of the topic (“hospital-volume and outcomes of pancreatic surgery”) faced, that has been, instead, very investigated so far. Rather I appreciate the fact that it has been selectively applied to a geographic area (such as the Caribbean) that may be paradigmatic of poor-resource regions worldwide. Please find below my comments, that I feel may ameliorate manuscript’s quality.

Major comments: 1) Why do the Authors started the manuscript with a “literature review” of one page and a half of history of pancreatic surgery description? The topic is well known and the Authors do no need to re-examine what has been done in the last century. The manuscript may benefit from having its own structure, even starting from a literature review but of the concept of “hospital-volume and pancreatic surgery”, not of “pancreatic surgery” per sé. 2) The Authors state: “We conducted a systematic literature search”. However this form is simplistic. The Authors should at least provide the period of the research queries, and the search strategy adopted (this latter may be reported as Supplementary content). 3) The manuscript by Balzano et al., BJS 2020, on the topic is missing at it should be added. 4) “Caribbean Experience” chapter: can the Authors provide insights on the distribution and the HPB volumes of the three Caribbean Centers mentioned? Any info about the number of surgeries performed, apart from the caseload of T&Tobago? Which is the estimated incidence of pancreatic cancer, to mention the most frequent indication to pancreatic surgery, in the Caribbean? Any information about pancreatic surgery in the other Countries, such as Cuba, Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico, Giamaica? How do the
health systems work? Are they mostly private, insurance-based? The readership may appreciate it. 5) Considering their Caribbean Experience, can the Authors re-evaluate their considerations in light of the manuscript “A Partnership Model Between High- and Low-Volume Hospitals to Improve Results in Hepatobiliary Pancreatic Surgery”, Annals of Surgery, 2014? Is such a partnership model applicable to the Caribbean? Minor comments: 1) The table 1 should include the year of the study, if not the study period as well.
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ID: 74021  Title: Whipple’s Operation Outcomes Are Acceptable in Low-Volume Caribbean Centers with a Modified Centralization Concept

Comments:
Conventional data suggest that complex operations, such as a pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD), should be limited to high volume centers. However, this is not practical in small, resource poor countries in the Caribbean. In these settings, PDs have to be performed locally at low volumes. We discuss our viewpoint on improving outcomes for PDs in this setting. In this paper, the authors review the evolution of the concept of the high-volume center and discuss the feasibility of this concept and the incorporation of PD into low-volume and resource-poor countries, such as those in the Caribbean. This paper has two parts. First, the authors performed a literature review evaluating studies published on outcomes after PD in high volume centers. The data in the Caribbean is then examined and discuss the incorporation of this operation into resource-poor hospitals with modifications of the centralization concept. In conclusion, most patients who require PD in the Caribbean do not have realistic opportunities to have surgery in high-volume centers in developed countries. In these settings, their only options are to have their operations in the resource-poor, low-volume settings in the Caribbean. However, it has been demonstrated that, despite low-volumes, the post-operative outcomes are acceptable with a modified centralization concept. The authors discuss the strategies employed in this setting to ensure good outcomes. It is a topic of interest to the researchers in the related areas, but the paper needs large improvements before acceptance for publication. My detailed comments are as follows: 1. In this review, the
authors review the evolution of the concept of the high-volume center and discuss the feasibility of this concept and the incorporation of PD into low-volume and resource-poor countries, such as those in the Caribbean. 2. The authors perform a literature review evaluating studies published on outcomes after PD in high volume centers. The data in the Caribbean is then examined and discuss the incorporation of this operation into resource-poor hospitals with modifications of the centralization concept, but the part of Surgeon Volumes and CARIBBEAN EXPERIENCE are too verbose and should be shortened to 300 words and the part of Male Fertility: How to Spot It is too simple, it should be discussed completely combined with references (should be add to 150-200 words) 3. The references are not up-to-date, references of the last 10 years should be cited, please cite last 10 years references, especially references for the last 5 years. Please make large revisions of references, especially in the parts of introduction and the part of Surgeon Volumes and CARIBBEAN EXPERIENCE. After making large revisions, the paper may be considered for publication.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The data examined in the Caribbean are very poor, compared to the data in the literature review of high-volume centers for pancreaticoduodenectomy. From these situation, your conclusion, “despite low-volumes, the postoperative outcomes are acceptable with a modified centralization concept”, cannot be obtained.
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Manuscript ID: 74021  Title: Whipple’s Operation Outcomes Are Acceptable in Low-Volume Caribbean Centers with a Modified Centralization Concept Comments: Conventional data suggest that complex operations, such as a pancreaticoduodenectomy (PD), should be limited to high volume centers. However, this is not practical in small, resource poor countries in the Caribbean. In these settings, PDs have to be performed locally at low volumes. We discuss our viewpoint on improving outcomes for PDs in this setting. In this paper, the authors review the evolution of the concept of the high-volume center and discuss the feasibility of this concept and the incorporation of PD into low-volume and resource-poor countries, such as those in the Caribbean. This paper has two parts. First, the authors performed a literature review evaluating studies published on outcomes after PD in high volume centers. The data in the Caribbean is then examined and discuss the incorporation of this operation into resource-poor hospitals with modifications of the centralization concept. In conclusion, most patients who require PD in the Caribbean do not have realistic opportunities to have surgery in high-volume centers in developed countries. In these settings, their only options are to have their operations in the resource-poor, low-volume settings in the Caribbean. However, it has been demonstrated that, despite low-volumes, the post-operative outcomes are acceptable with a modified centralization concept. The authors discuss the strategies employed in this setting to ensure good outcomes. It is a topic of interest to the researchers in the related areas, my detailed comments are as follows:

1. The paper reviewed the evolution of the concept of the high-volume center. And discussed the feasibility of this concept and the incorporation of PD into low-volume
and resource-poor countries, such as those in the Caribbean. 2. Results are good, and the figures are clear. 3. The language is fluent. 4. The references are not up-to-date, references of the last 10 years should be cited, please cite last 10 years references, especially references for the last 5 years. 5. The tables should use the format of 3-line table, please revise the format of the tables to 3-line table, especially Table 1-6. Please make some revisions, especially in the parts of references. After making some revisions, the paper may be considered for publication.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
In its present form, the manuscript should be published in our journal.
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This manuscript showed Whipple’s operation outcomes in low-volume caribbean centers. This paper is well revised and acceptable for publication.