

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ales-23-38>

Comments	Response	Changes made
<p>Reviewer A:</p> <p>The manuscript on exam is a non-systemic literature review on the outcomes of 3-D LPN and RPN performed for renal masses. According to the authors, laparoscopy augmented with 3D vision remains a plausible added advantage to the already efficient traditional laparoscopic system, making it more acceptable and cost-effective alternative to robotic surgery. It also shortens the learning curve of novice surgeons and augments their laparoscopic skill-sets. In surgeons with experienced hands, PN can be successfully performed far more safely, efficiently and cost-efficiently using 3D-laparoscopy. The manuscript deals with this topic in a fairly exhaustive way but the conclusions are data or evidence already widely discussed and present in the existing literature; moreover, the study lacks a statistical comparison between the two surgical procedures, laparoscopic and robot-assisted.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>This is the first narrative review that was performed that describes the stand of 3D laparoscopic partial nephrectomy with respect to partial nephrectomy surgery in the era of robotic surgery.</p> <p>This article is of particular importance in the light of lack of upfront head on trials that compared the outcomes of 3D laparoscopic partial nephrectomy with robotic partial nephrectomy</p> <p>We described studies which compared the traditional LPN with 3DLPN and in turn this data was compared with the studies that described the outcomes of RPN.</p> <p>Lack of prospective or retrospective studies that compared 3D LPN and RPN precluded us from reporting objective evidence in terms with perioperative outcomes such as blood loss, operative duration or oncological outcomes such as survival etc. So, in light of above stated deficiencies in the available literature, our narrative review provides valuable information that describes the role of 3D Laparoscopy in the era of robotic surgery.</p>	

<p>Reviewer B:</p> <p>The authors of this study aimed to assess to identify and review the available literature on 3D-assisted PN and determine the state of affairs of 3D laparoscopic imaging.</p> <p>The aims of this review are poorly described. I suggest the authors to be clear about the goals.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>Changes were made accordingly.</p>	<p>Page 3 Line – 107-110</p>
<p>Line 51 there an incomplete sentence. I suggest the authors to adjust it.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>Changes were made accordingly.</p>	<p>Page 2 Line- 51-52</p>
<p>Line 54 I suggest the authors to define the “grey literature”</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>Grey literature includes research that is produced outside the traditional commercial and academic publishing and distribution channels. In our study, the grey literature search was performed in Google scholar</p>	
<p>Line 78 the phrase needs a citation.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>Citation added</p>	
<p>Many of the data presented in the introduction section needs proper citations. (lines 83 till 88)</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>Citations are added</p>	
<p>Line 99 - What does seminal advances mean? I suggest the authors to change the text to retain the message.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>‘Seminal’ adjective here states ‘very important and having a strong influence on later developments.</p> <p>The word has been changed from ‘seminal’ to ‘significant’</p>	<p>Page 3 Line 97</p>

<p>Line 108-I suggest the authors to detail what current state of affairs mean. It is important to allow the readers here to know what the authors studied and how this review is bringing novelty compared with other already published review on this topic.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>The sentence has been rephrased</p>	<p>Page 4 Line 107-110</p>
<p>In the results section I suggest the authors to provide a clear number of the studies identified by the keywords search, how many were excluded based on the set criteria, and how many were letter to editors, commentaries etc.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>The exact number of the studies along with the number and type of articles excluded (letter to editors, commentaries etc) were not noted as this is a narrative review and not a systematic review.</p> <p>Due to the sparcitiy of evidence on comparative studies on 3D laparoscopic versus robotic partial nephrectomies, most of the available literature including the review articles were also considered and reviewed for our manuscript.</p>	
<p>Line 184 and 185 – what seminal inventions mean?</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>‘Seminal’ adjective here states ‘very important and having a strong influence on later developments.</p> <p>The word has been changed from ‘seminal’ to ‘significant’</p>	<p>Page 6 Line 189</p>
<p>In Table 1 the studies are not proper cited. I suggest the authors to correct this.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>The citations were corrected.</p>	
<p>In the results section the authors present many results from studies that are not in among the 9 studies revealed by the search. There are studies in Table 1 that they have none of their results presented.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>The results from the studies identified from the literature search were discussed and appropriately cited.</p>	
<p>This review aims to discuss the results from the studies identified in the search. This goal has not been achieved.</p>	<p>Thank you for the comment</p> <p>The results from the studies identified from the literature search were discussed and appropriately cited.</p>	<p>Page 7 Line 212-217</p>

		Page 7 Line 223=224
What is the purpose of Figure 1 for this review? I suggest the authors to clearly state the role of the figure for the readers.	Thank you for the comment The Figure states the usual surgical setup that depicts the location of ultrasound machine with which IOUS guided LPN can be efficiently performed.	
Reviewer C: Authors are encouraged to review the manuscript for minor grammar and typing mistakes.	Thank you for the comment The changes were made	Throughout the manuscript