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Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The authors reported data from 26 patients who underwent resection of pancreatic metastases and extra-pancreatic metastases from renal cell carcinoma. The Authors reported the short and long-term results including the evaluation of the quality of life through WHOQOL-BREF questionnaire. They concluded that 1-there is no differences in survival between group A (extra-PM) and group B (PM); 2- surgery alone leads to better quality of life and cost-effectiveness benefits.

The paper is interesting but I have some comments:
1-Background have to be succinct; patients and methods section is well-detailed; results section is concise even if the statistical analysis is poor; discussion come to reasonable conclusions on the basis of data presented even if the comparison of Group a with Groub B is not underlined; 2-all table are not clear. I suggest to do a baseline table (table 1) including the characteristics of the patients and the type of surgery performed and a table comparing group A with group B (table 2). Table 3 could be reported only in the text, thus can be eliminated. Table 4 have to be improved.
3-figure 1 and 2 are of poor quality. Improve the quality.

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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