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**Reviewer’s report:**

The meta-analysis compared with oncological outcome and surgical outcome between laparoscopic and robotic distal pancreatectomy. The study design is appropriate and the clinical question is important. However, meta-analysis of retrospective studies are prone to bias and level of evidence is inferior. Methodology and study design needed further elaboration for better interpretation and understandings.

1. Criteria of selection of article should be clearly stated, including date of data search, human studies, language of articles and minimal number of objects in the study.

2. In 2nd paragraph under heading of "inclusion criteria, intra-abdominal abscess was one of the outcome measures while no analysis on that was found. Please state clearly what morbidity are included in this studies

3. According to funnel plots, publications bias was present in numbers of analysis including conversion rate and hospital stay. The author should better state its presence and describe in their manuscript. Quantitative analysis will be more appropriate.

4. What is use of classification of heterogeneity into low, moderate and high level? If not indicated, please delete it.

5. For pancreatic fistula, it is appropriate to perform the analysis only if they follow the same definitions, i.e. ISGPF. And it is important to show which 6 article are using this classifications.

6. In "result", is there any difference in demographics in any of the articles? if no analysis was performed, it cannot be stated that "....... two groups were similar...."

7. For oncological parameters, further elaboration and clarification of results is recommended. Though results on oncological outcome was diverse, table showing the result of different article is recommended.

**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.

No

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

No

**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:

Acceptable
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