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Author's response to reviews: see over
We sincerely thank the reviewers for their important and thoughtful contributions that significantly improved the quality of the presented manuscript. All the modifications that were performed are highlighted in red. A conspicuous portion of the manuscript was re-arranged or corrected according to the reviewers criticisms.

Reviewer 1

1) please change the title as follows: Robotic radical nephrectomy for renal cella carcinoma: a systematic review
Performed.

2-3) in the abstract and all along the paper specify that this is a systematic review, this is a point of force! and probably the key issue of this research. The "aim of the study" should be modified as follow : To perform a systematic review on the role of robotic radical nephrectomy . From my point of view it is redundant to specify for the surgical management of the RCC .... why a surgeon should use a radical nephrectomy for other reasons?

According to the reviewer's criticism, the aim of the study, both in the abstract and in the main text was modified as requested. The phrase "for the surgical management of the RCC" was also removed. An imprinting of systematic review was given to the manuscript (title, aim, discussion).

4) in the first sentence of the intro : please update the reference number 1: you are writing in 2014 and why do you cite an old reference (2008)?
Performed. Epidemiologic data was updated to 2014.

5) please correct at line 90 "single-siste" in "single-site"
Performed.

6) please improve the aim of the study as previously suggested
Performed.

7) Please present a flowchart of papers selection as figure 1, indicating the reasons for the exclusion and the number of good articles you reviewed.
Performed, thank you.

8) move the paragraph "nine manuscript ...." from line 135 to line 133.
Performed.

9-10) after the sentences about the concise presentation of the results in the tables try to describe better your results (e.g. look at line 149) and absolutely avoid do some personal considerations in the results section. For example the block from 140 to 148 is absolutely useless and wrong in the results section and it is useful in the discussion.I suggest to totally rebuilt the paper in a structured way please look at attach
We thank a lot the reviewer for this criticism. A great part of the results section, as requested, was brought to the Discussion, that was extensively modified in order to improve the global readability of the manuscript. We think that now the Discussion has a more clear and "fluid" structure: overall analysis of the current literature -> route of access in RRN -> RRN perioperative outcomes -> RRN oncologic efficacy --> RRN complications -> RRN reported theoretical advantages --> analysis of comparative studies and cost analysis-> EAU guidelines on RRN --> fields for further application of robotics in the field of special cases of radical nephrectomy.

11) the tables are confused, please take your time to improve the general readability, please specify all the acronyms used in a proper legend, please specify if the reported data are mean or median!!!!

The legends were added as requested. The reported data are now presented as mean or median after a thorough reevaluation of the included manuscripts.

12) please edit all the references following the rules for BMC Urology

Performed.

Reviewer 2

1. It is not very clear from the article whether it is just a review on the current utilization of robotics for the treatment of renal tumors or a direct comparison between the standard of care (lap nephrectomy) to RRN. The conclusions point to this intention while the abstract and background do not discuss this comparative nature of the review. To my opinion it should be focused on the current available evidence, if any, for the use of the robot for RN.

We thank the reviewer for his observation. We added the sentence "To analyze the comparative studies between RRN and open nephrectomy (ON)/LRN." in the abstract and the sentence "The available comparative studies between RRN and ON/LRN were also analyzed." in the aim of the manuscript section (line 89). We prefer keeping the comparative studies in the manuscript, since we think that they globally improve its completeness and they are probably of interest to the reader.

2)The background section of the abstract should also include a sentence on robotics for RN.

Performed, thank you for the observation.

3) In the introduction section of the main text the aim of the review should be stated accordingly.

Performed.

4) The paragraph starting with "following these pioneering studies...and open surgery" can be omitted.

Performed.

5) There is no clear distinction between the results section and the discussion, the information is given in a non-organized order, and the reader is somewhat confused. I would suggest to the authors to separately
discuss the advantages and drawbacks of RRN versus LRN in terms of oncologic efficacy, tumor stage (T1-T2) and pathology, operative time and complications, cost, utility and current availability of the robotic facility in Europe.

We thank the reviewer for this important criticism. A great part of the results section, as requested, was brought to the Discussion, that was extensively modified in order to add in the global readability of the manuscript. We think that now the Discussion has a more clear and “fluid” structure: overall analysis of the current literature -> route of access in RRN -> RRN perioperative outcomes -> RRN oncologic efficacy --> RRN complications -> RRN reported theoretical advantages --> analysis of comparative studies and cost analysis-> EAU guidelines on RRN -> fields for further application of robotics in the field of special cases of radical nephrectomy.

Reviewer 3

I have only the following Minor Essential Revisions for the authors:

- Line 46: remove “” in ““robotic radical

  Performed.

- Line 57: change “On” with “ON”

  Performed.

- Line 128: If the sentence start with a number please write it in a word.

  Performed.

Tables -Table 1 and 2: Please specify better in the table legends that “Perioperative outcomes” and “Oncologic outcomes” are for RRC for RCC. It should be specified here.

  Performed.