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Reviewer's report:

The paper by Chen et al. provides a meta-analysis and systematic revision comparing the safety and efficacy of robotic versus laparoscopic gastrectomy for gastric cancer. To date, very few studies have provided a comprehensive and accurate point of view on this specific issue. For these reasons, the paper appears of very high originality and scientific relevance.

On the other hand, some criticisms have to be raised:

General points:

a) As recently reported, all systematic revision should be written according with PRISMA guidelines. Interestingly, the entire manuscript respects the PRISMA checklist thus supporting the quality of the provided meta-analysis, but we recommend to the authors to specify in the text that the study was conducted according with PRISMA guidelines.

b) In the Discussion Section some points for future developments must be provided. As the authors know, new robotic platforms are now available. In particular, Da Vinci Xi is progressively replacing Si system with the primary aim to reduce surgical time allowing with articulating arms multi-quadrant surgery. Therefore, we suggest to the authors to briefly introduce this point in the Discussion section.

c) As reported in the Results section, in obese patients robotic approach seems to provide all the well-known benefits without increased surgical time. Therefore, we suggest to emphasize these findings in the discussion section.

d) English language should be improved.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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