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Reviewer's report:

The present study compares open and laparoscopic approaches for postchemotherapy RPLND in patients with residual masses in the clinical context of testicular cancer. The authors have compared intraoperative parameters, complications and post-operative tumor recurrence between these 2 subgroups, with a large subset undergoing a laparoscopic approach (n=43) versus an open approach (n=24). Overall, this is an interesting study but needs a host of revisions before it would be suitable for publication:

1. Within the abstract, there is no Methods section which would need to be included.

2. Within the manuscript, the methods section is at the end of the manuscript following the conclusions which should be re-arranged.

3. Were the open and laparoscopic cases performed concurrently? and if so, what were the selection criteria for either approach?

4. The Clavien system was described to address postoperative complications. The authors have used it as a system to classify intraoperative complications. What was the type and incidence of perioperative complications in the two subgroups?

5. Was there any difference in the lymph node yield between the two approaches? Was there cancer in any of the nodes removed and what was their respective histology?

6. In how many laparoscopic cases was dissection performed behind the great vessels and complete lumbar vessel clipping/cutting using a traditional "split and role" technique?

7. The authors should state how many recurrences were in field and how many were distant.

8. What was the mortality rate (if any) in the two subgroups?

9. The manuscript would benefit from scientific editing prior to being reconsidered for publication.
**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.