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Reviewer’s report:

the aim of this study is to investigate the role of Mannitol for ameliorating of the renal warm ischemia damage during partial nephrectomy.

This is done in a porcine model with 3 groups: laparoscopic dissection of the renal pedicule (sham), and 2 groups with 30 minutes ischemia, of which one group recieved mannitol before ischemia.

after 21 days observation the ischemic kidneys had a reduction of 25% of the number of glomeruli. this was prevented by mannitol in the other group.

Comments:

1. when was the randomisation between groups made? ideally, this should be done after dissection of the renal pedicule.

2. which analgesia did the pigs recieve after surgery and did they recieve antibiotics?

3. How was the blood samples drawn in the observation period? (is is not mentioned, if there is left venous catheter ind the pigs)

4. When the stereological examinations were carried out - was the samples blinded (between groups)?

5. On page 8, line 39 it is stated that mannitol increases the operating time and costs, for the first, the administration can be timed, so the aditional minutes are minimal; for the second, the costs of mannitol are minimal compared to the rest of the costs during a laparoscopic partial nephrectomy.

6. Table 2: pæast part with mannitol data lacks + -.

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?**  
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