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Reviewer's report:

In this paper, Authors report their initial experience with robotic selective clamping of segmental renal arteries for RAPN in cases of multiple lesions. A previous similar work by the same group has been published in 2017 using the pure laparoscopic technique.

Even if the casistic is still initial, they show the feasibility of this technique for skilled robotic surgeons. The article is overall well written and the topic is interesting.

My concern is why such small lesions are not approached clampless (with selective clamping just in case of bleeding). Moreover, Authors didn't report the number of cases of multiple renal tumors in which this selective clamping was not possible. It can have an interest to compare those two populations (i.e. number and dimensions of lesions; RENAL score etc.). Could Authors address those arguments in the "Discussion" section?

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.
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