Reviewer's report

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

Version: 2 Date: 24 May 2014

Reviewer: Petros Sountoulides

Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions

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

2. In the introduction section of the main text the aim of the review should be stated accordingly. The paragraph starting with "following these pioneering studies...and open surgery" can be omitted.

3. 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.

I hope that my suggestion would help in increasing the impact of your paper.
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