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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting paper about urological research. The paper is well written and very clear.

Minor essential revision

- In the result section, it could be interesting to group table 2 and 3 and to present also results about topics, methodology in this table. It is not very clear in the text what are the different categories of topics.

Some aspects could be included in the discussion

- Time studied: there were only 2 years between the 2010 conference and 30th September 2012. Is this time sufficient to observe all publications?
- Figure 2: It is interesting to quote number of years studied to observe publications. It would be also interesting to quote databases used to find publications since it can change results a lot.

Discretionary revision

- Do you know if the first author was the same in the abstract and in the publication? In case of not, is there any impact of this result?
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