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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to Reviewer #1:

Yigit Akin (Reviewer 1): The partial nephrectomy is suggested for all T1 kidney tumors. Furthermore, some suitable T2-may be T3 cases are candidate for partial nephrectomy. Thus references can be updated and whole paper should be designed again.

• Response:

We completely agree with this valuable suggestion that “some suitable T2-may be T3 cases are candidate for partial nephrectomy”, and our search strategy (“barbed” OR “knotless” AND “suturing” OR “suture”) did not focus only on T1 cases. Since our article is a systematic review(meta-analysis) of all the published papers, we think the reason may be the fact that barbed sutures were applied most in T1 cases.

To better our application of our article, we add the following statements in our limitations with highlight :

“ but the barbed suture only suggested for all T1 kidney tumors rather than some suitable T2-may be or T3 cases.”

Thank you again for your great help!
Responses to Reviewer #2:

Cristian Fiori (Reviewer 2): The Authors explore the role of barbed suture in the setting of PN. They performed a systematic review of the Literature and analysed 8 cohort of studies (and no RCT) and they found that barbed suture may reduce WIT and post operative complications. They concluded that the barbed suture is a useful surgical innovation both for surgeons and Patients even if they suggest that randomly-designed studies with longer follow up and larger sample sizes are needed to confirm the results of their analysis.

Overall the paper focused on an interesting technical detail.

I have some suggestions/criticisms for the Authors.

· Response:

Thanks for your positive comments. We really appreciate your time for reviewing this manuscript. Our answers are as follows after each of your suggestion:

Title. Why …. "For the patients and surgeons"? The Authors did not investigated the "preferences" of the surgeons and there is no mention on questionnaires on the "appreciation" of the suture by the surgeon.

So I suggest the modification of the title (focusing on perioperative results …."The Application of Barbed Sutures during the Partial Nephrectomy may modify perioperative results.. " or similar)

· Response:

Thank you for your kindly comments. We modified our title to “The application of Barbed Suture during the Partial Nephrectomy may modify perioperative results: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis”, according to your great suggestion and highlighted the title in the manuscript-revised.

Background.

First line: not only for small tumours but also for larger (until 7cm and more) when technically feasible.

Second line: I do not agree, even type of resection (enucleation/wedge resection etc) may play a role (see references), such as the type of suture.

Please soften this statement
"no one can be fully satisfactory to health providers and patients". Is it an opinion of the Authors? If no please give a reference. In general the sentence does not make sense to me. Please change it.

Line 34 "this technique". Which technique? The use of barbed suture is not a technique…

Response:

Thank you for your suggestions. We had rephrased the sentences you mentioned and highlighted in the revised manuscript

1. We had modified the first line by adding a sentence:

   “With the development of the surgical technology, larger (until 7cm and more) cases may also be the appropriate candidates.”

2. We had modified the sentence in the second line:

   “Type of resection, type of suture and the change of renal function usually play a significant role during the perioperative period of PN”

3. We had modified the sentence “no one can be fully satisfactory to health providers and patients” to

   “different approaches still had their own advantages and disadvantages”

4. Line 34: we changed the “technique” to “approach”

Mat and Meth. Adequate

Response: Thanks for your positive comments.

Results. Adequate.

May the Authors share with the readers if the different groups (barbed vs no barbed) were comparable (demographic data, tumour characteristics) etc for all studies?

Response:
Thank you for your suggestions. All the baseline characteristics you mentioned were comparable in each paper included and we had stated all of them in Table 1. We added a sentence in Results with highlight:

“All the data were comparable”

Discussion "SCr and eGFR were the most commonly used tools to evaluate renal function after PN[1], but the change of these two indexes were only reported in four studies[19,20,22,23]. Since all the raw data suggested no significant shift between both groups, many researchers believed that the results needed larger sample size[23] and longer follow up time to confirm, say at least 5-year follow up[20]. There are many way to determine loss of renal function and evaluate the effects of surgery on renal function (see references). Please cite it.

I totally agree with the limit's disclosure proposed by the Authors.

References:

Introduction and discussion may be improved by using these papers:


Response:

We really appreciated your comments and your references. And we believed they were great contribution to our manuscript.

We added one more sentence in the discussion with highlight

“Besides, there are many ways to determine loss of renal function and evaluate the effects of surgery on renal function, such as renal scan and volumetric assessment of the kidney, which were not reported in the articles included.”
And we cited the sentence using the last two references you suggested ([26,27]). And we cited the first reference in “Background” after the sentence “Type of resection, type of suture and the change of renal function usually play a significant role during the perioperative period of PN” and the reference number is “[2]”

Response to editor:

Improvements to the English language within my manuscript have not been requested but we still have had this manuscript modified via Nature Publishing Group Language Editing suggested in the editors’ email.