Response to reviewer
Dear reviewer:

Thank you for allowing us to review our manuscript to *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery*. According with your advice, we amended the relevant part in manuscript. Please see below our response in a "point-by-point" fashion. Should you have any questions, please contact us without hesitate.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

On the behalf of the authors,
Da-Fang Zhang
Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery
Peking University People's Hospital
Beijing, China

Summary of the Peer-Review Report:

- **The authors have made a good attempt to project the problem of overtime surgery on the prognosis of patients, however the study design does not define the issue on scientific analysis. Authors have to clearly define the issue of overtime with the surgeons. This point seems very confusing in the methods section.**
  After revision, the issue of overtime with the surgeons has been defined in the methods section.
- **A clear scientific method like; Karolinska sleepiness scale, S-P fatigue scale needs to be included and the factors analysed accordingly.**
  After revision, Karolinska sleepiness scale have been included to analyse the degree of fatigue of the surgeon.
- **Prolonged operation time in patients undergoing pancreatectomies is reported to be associated with complications such as surgical site infection , thromboembolism , pneumonia.These points need to be included after analysis.**
  After revision, surgical site infection (abdominal infection), thromboembolism and pneumonia have been included after analysis.
- **Higher incidence of pancreatic fistula is well taken but why shoul delayed gastric emptying incidence improve with prolonged Operative times. I don't agree with this statement.**
  After revision, only grades B and C of delayed gastric emptying were included in the postoperative complication analysis. There was no statistically significant difference in the incidence of delayed gastric emptying between the two groups.
- **Result section can be shortened by including the figures in a table manner.**
  After revision, result section have been shortened by adding table.
- **Other complications of Pancreatic resection should be included.**
  After revision, all complications of Pancreatic resection have been included.
- **10 patients have died; what were the causes of death. Was any case of post pancreatectomy haemorrhage responsible. This issue needs to be explained in detail.**
  After revision, Causes of death have been explain in the result section. Two patients died of bleeding.
- **However, they need to better clarify the phrase: "Potential confounders were selected based on a p-value less than 0.2 in the univariable analysis….". Did authors actually mean "p-value less than 0.2 " ? Please check it out.**
  In fact, the authors wanted to express that variables with p-values less than 0.2 in univariate logistic regression models will be included in the multivariable logistic regression analysis. The authors has reorganized the

language to express it more clearly.

- **There are several recent studies, in the last 2 to 3 years, on outcomes of pancreaticoduodenectomy that should be addressed in this manuscript.**
  After revision, several recent studies have been cited in this manuscript.
- **We understand that the investigators should attempt to indicate more clearly the limitations of this study. Possibly, adding more details. For example, the subgroup analysis considering different diagnosis (not only location of lesions), and also different types of surgeries, and the different surgical teams, might render the final analysis difficult to interpret (due to small numbers considering the subgroups).Therefore, the results of this study should be interpreted with caution.**
  The authors have made appropriate changes in the discussion section.
- **The authors should attempt to improve the Discussion section adding more thoughts and discussion with recent references referring to outcomes of pancreaticoduodenectomy**
  After revision, the authors have appropriately expanded the discussion section and cited recent studies.
- **Minor points: 1) Check the text for language incorrections and punctuation. 2) Check the text related to Statistical analysis (and explanation on P values).**
  The authors have checked the above section and made appropriate modifications.