## Peer Review File

## Article information: https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/ls-21-15

Comment 1. Most importantly, I would have preferred to see how laparoscopic resection of large adrenal tumors larger than 5 cm actually affects the final outcome of patients. For example, overall survival? I would like the authors to add this aspect to the results. This should not be difficult to do and would require a collation of the 15 articles that were eventually selected regarding this aspect of the results.

**Reply:** Overall survival data added to results. (See page 13/line 250-256)

Comment 2. Another important point is that, as a systematic review, the authors did not evaluate the quality of the selected articles. The authors need to add the results in this regard. And, revise the conclusions, based on quality appraisal such as risk of bias.

**Reply**: Risk of bias evaluated using Newcastle-ottawa scale and findings added to abstract (see page 2 /line 31-32) and in the body of the study (see page 5 /line 111-113)

Comment 3. Abstract: no risk of bias of methods and results, no information about limitation of evidence, and no registration status (if not registered, it is recommended to disclose the absence of this registration status).

**Reply** -risk of bias evaluation (Newcastle-ottawa scale) added (see page 2 /line 31-32). Limitation of evidence mentioned in the conclusion (see page 2 /line 48-49). Registration status added (see page 2 /line 36)

Comment 4. Abstract: The definition of large or small tumor is always 5cm in the full text, but in the abstract, why is the conclusion >6cm instead of >5cm?
**Reply** -definition in the conclusion corrected to >5cm. (see page 2 /line 44)

Comment 5. Flowchart: The data seems to be incorrect, 156-136=21? Need to check if it is typo.

**Reply-** data rechecked and flowchart updated. (See page 7)

Comment 6. Flowchart: Pubmed should be PubMed.

**Reply-** flowchart updated with change (See page 7)

Comment 7. Tables: table 1, table 2, table 3 are actually figures, not tables. I suggest that the

authors integrate them together as a real table. If the authors prefer to present trends and changes with pictures, then change the title to figure accordingly.

**Reply-**Tables 1,2,3 renamed as Figures 1,2,3. (See page 10 - 12)

Comment 8. Tables: Please number the table "Overview of the studies evaluated in this article"
**Reply-**New tables added (See page 13 - 19)

Comment 9. Tables: Table "Overview of the studies evaluated in this article" is not very beautiful, missing a lot of information, and not easy to read to highlight important findings. I suggest that the authors split it into 2 tables, one to present the basics of the included literature and one to summarize the core findings of these papers (because the authors stated inside the methodology that many indicators were evaluated, but the results were highly summarized with a generalized outcomes that should show the results of these indicators one by one). Specifically:
Table 1 could incorporate comprehensive information on Study, year, N, G/n, Age, Study methods (now this result are missing not written inside the table), etc. Table 2 could have included Study, operative time, blood loss, surgical complications, average length of hospital stay, conversion to open surgery & tumor recurrence, conclusion, quality appraisal.

**Reply-**New tables added (See page 13 - 19)