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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Central to the entire subject of Pancreatecoduodenectomy (PD) are postoperative mortality and morbidity. Although operative mortality in patients undergoing PD has decreased, the incidence of postoperative morbidity remains high. Postoperative pancreatic fistula (POPF) is the most common complication, with rates ranging from 5% to 30%. Many methods have been described to decrease the risk of POPF, including the use of drugs, prophylactic pancreatic stenting, and refinements in pancreatic reconstruction techniques. The most commonly used pancreatic reconstruction techniques are pancreaticogastrostomy (PJ) and pancreaticojejunostomy (PJ). Several methods of PJ currently exist, the 2 most common of which are duct-to-mucosa PJ and invagination PJ. Both the PJ’s have numerous modifications which claim to decrease in POPF rate. Despite all this POPF, still remains a major challenge for surgeons. No surgical technique gives any advantage in eliminating the risk of pancreatic fistula. The authors have proposed a surgical technical advancement for decreasing the rate of POPF. 62 patients had PD and on retrospective analysis done on two groups (Traditional duct to mucosa PJ versus One half rear wall reinforced PJ), conclusion made favoured the new technique in decreasing the POPF rate as well as hospital stay. The basis of this technical progress is made on the assumption that the leaks occur more posteriorly in the PJ anastomosis. There are several questions: How was randomization of cases done. How do authors support the posterior leak predominance rate. There are several modifications of PJ which seem to be very similar to what authors are describing. The authors need to explore all of them and a clear distinction between them and the one which authors are describing needs to be detailed out and the major differences need to
be highlighted. Extensive shortening of the text, especially in the technique section, needs to be done. Editing of the English language needs attention.
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**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

A well-written, retrospective study. As it is known, there are many predisposing factors in the etiology of POPF. It is striking that the patient groups included in the study have similar demographic characteristics. However, it was not stated whether the authors included patients who received preoperative neoadjuvant therapy in this retrospective study they designed. I think that an addition should be made in the article regarding the inclusion or exclusion of this situation. I believe that the value of this anastomosis technique in terms of POPF can be demonstrated more clearly with propensity score matching analysis studies or randomized controlled prospective studies.