

## **Response to reviewer's comments**

We thank the editors and referees for the time taken to carefully review our manuscript and for helpful suggestions. Specific responses to reviewer's comments are as follows.

<Reviewer #1>

This is a retrospective study regarding PTENs, with the analysis data adopts various inspection methods, and reliability. The logic is reasonable, and the expression is accurate. The research results are presented in the form of data, which is intuitive and clear. However, I still have some concerns before it finally accepts. below is my details comment:

1. laparoscopic pancreatic surgery (LPS) has been given the first time the abbreviation, can be used directly later, do not alternate the full name and abbreviation; distal pancreatectomy abbreviation to be reflected;

**We thanks you for carefully review. As the reviewer say, we fixed it as reviewer pointed out.**

2. Inclusion criteria and exclusion criteria are not accurately expressed;

**We thanks you for carefully review. As the reviewer say, we fixed it as reviewer pointed out. 92 patients underwent pancreatic resection for PNENs at Kumamoto University Hospital. Of them, 10 patients (11%) were excluded from this analysis because of distant metastases and coexisting tumors other than PNENs.**

3."Results" mentioned that 14 patients had multiple tumors, but how understand the multiple tumors?

**We thanks you for carefully review. We have defined multiple tumors if there are two tumors and more than two tumors.**

4. References are too old;

**We thanks you for carefully review. As the reviewer say, we changed some references to**

**new ones.**

5. Why choose the tumor diameter 20mm for analysis? Why not choose other size as standard?

**We thanks you for carefully review. As the reviewer say, it is very important point.**

**In generally, 20 mm is a very important borderline for the T factor of pancreatic tumor. In pancreatic cancer, 20 mm is positioned as the boundary between T1 and T2 in T category. So, we choose the tumor diameter 20 mm for analysis.**

6. It is recommended that additional patient findings be added for single - factor analysis.

**We thanks you for carefully review. As the reviewer say, we newly added the tumor location as the additional patient findings in Table 1.**

7. Standards for LN metastasis are not stated, with ambiguous problems. For example, did the researcher exclude all possible transferred lymph nodes? It is suggested that lymph nodes metastasis can be subdivided into near and distant metastasis, may be more clinical significance.

**We thanks you for carefully review. As the reviewer say, it is very important point. We excluded 10 patients who had distant metastases, including distant LN metastasis.**