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Reviewer's report:

The present article is intended to investigate whether patients with LND had improved survival in UTUC patients. It is a well written article on an interesting topic with previous controversial reports (as the authors state). Some observations must be made.

1. Background adequately presents the knowledge gap and why the study is relevant.

2. Methods are adequate for the objective of the study.

3. The results are well analyzed and presented. Minor issues in this section:
   
   In the third line of the second paragraph - scores are shown in Table 2, not Table 3
   
   The last sentence of the latter paragraph should be rephrased: 'Commonly identified concern was the comparability of LND and NLND groups, especially regarding tumor grade and TNM staging'

4. Discussion is long. Comments on each issue should be much more concise and get to the point; i.e. absence of difference between LND and NLND groups regarding CSS and RFS. Paragraph 4 is a good example.

5. Limitations are adequately mentioned.

6. Overall, the conclusions regarding uncertainty of the role of LND in UTUC survival is correct in the light of the weak evidence level. The present study is a good summary of current information on the issue and undermines the need for prospective, multicentric trials.
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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