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Reviewer's report:

The paper describes two different approaches to the adrenal gland by the retroperitoneoscopic adrenalectomy in lateral decubitus. The paper it is interesting as it focus on technical details of the operation. Nevertheless, few points should be addressed and improved before considering publication in the journal. 1. The surgical technique, as it is the issue of the paper, should be better described. The figure should be more descriptive. Which side, for example, is represented? It is not indicated. 2. In my experience there is a difference between the right and the left adrenal gland due to the different position of the gland in relation to the kidney. Is a mobilisation of the kidney necessary, at least for the left side? 3. Which approach has been used for which patients? In other words, how the authors decide the approach to be used for which patients. Was the amount of fatty tissue into the retroperitoneum considered to make a decision? 4. For the IPFA approach at which level is the division of the peripheic fat started? This decision can be difficult in obese patients. 5. Especially in male patients the fatty tissue is often strongly attached to the kidney. Is there any suggestion about the best approach in those cases. This is a point to be discussed. 6. The Table describing the patients should be improved. The clinical diagnosis is not indicated. The authors indicate only the pathology. 7. For suspicious malignant tumours would the authors still suggest an IPFA approach? It is probably oncologically more correct to perform en-bloc resection of tumor and fatty tissue. 8. I suggest to add a subgroup analysis in the section results separating male and female patients. 9. The authors stated that for partial adrenalectomy the central adrenal vein should be reserved. There are a lot of studies showing that is not necessary. 10. The bibliography has to be improved as well. The main studies on retroperitoneoscopic adrenalectomy are not cited. 11. Injury of the peritoneum during retroperitoneoscopic adrenalectomy is a very rare complication. How the authors explain the high incidence of this complication in the EPFA group?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
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**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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