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Reviewer's report:

The authors have improved their paper under the suggestions of the reviewers. However I have some recommendation:

I suggest to give the real p value on the tables which may give more strength to the value itself.

Maybe a figure depicting the liver retraction during a LA for a large tumor can give a better picture of the surgical field and of the visualization how the cava might be.

Can you comment some tips or clue you have learned after the first 30 cases that may have improved the results? For example, did the new devices influenced the better results of the latest cases during the decades of the study?

As you used both, do you have any preferences between Ultrasonic or Ligasure devices?

As you said "for the poor oncological outcome and the high risk of peritoneal dissemination of primary adrenal cancer" malignances are currently contraindication for minimally invasive approach and they are very few in the literature. Furthermore, you state that "no specimen was found malignant at definitive pathology". However, in your series there are 3 cases of malignant metastases. Could you state which was the primary tumor and if you suspected it preoperatively and if yes why you decided to resect those laparoscopically?

In your opinion, are the oncological and peritoneal dissemination different between metastases and primary tumor? Can you comment about the oncological follow up of these 3 patients?
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.

Yes

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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