Reviewer's report

Title: Current evidence on robotic radical nephrectomy for renal cell carcinoma.

Version: 2 Date: 24 May 2014

Reviewer: Pietro Castellan

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

no

Minor Essential Revisions

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

2) 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.

3) 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?

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)?

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

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

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

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

9) 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.

10) I suggest to totally rebuilt the paper in a structured way please look at attach

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!!!!

12) please edit all the references following the rules for BMC Urology
Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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.
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