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Reviewer's report:

Authors have assessed various nephrometries score to predict renal functional loss after partial nephrectomy. I have following observations on the current submission.

1. The title is long, authors may consider to call them various "nephrometry scores" however, they may retain the title as well. I am not entirely sure as to the meaning and context of the word "individual" in the title.
2. Abstract is not well written it is not conveying the actual contents of the manuscript. There are language issues but more importantly, the objectives, and results needs special attention. In the objectives nuclear medicine tests should be replaced phrase radio isotope scan. In the results there is no direct mention of the MAG3 scan findings only correlation's were given, I understand the word limitations in the abstract is an issue, however authors needs to use some ingenuity to phrase the results.
3. Introduction can be significantly improved, the rationale needs to be better defined, there are many pertinent recent studies on radio isotope scan and partial nephrectomy that failed to be mentioned in the introduction, whereas the authors noted scarce data.
4. Results section is well described and tables add real value.
5. Conclusions needs rephrasing particularly the last sentence concerning CSA and C index
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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