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Dear Dr. Busch,

Thank you for your recent submission to BMC Urology. Before we can proceed we will need you to make some changes to your manuscript. We strongly urge you to respond to our requests promptly, as we cannot start the peer review process until we have received a version containing the following changes.

1. Ethical Approval
   Can you please include the full name of the ethical committee that granted approval for your study.

   *Reply by Busch et al:* Thank for this remark. The correct translated term would be Charité ethical committee. We changed this within the manuscript (method section).

2. Related Literature and Advances
   We not that you have published a similar study (PubMedID: 21044243) but have not discussed or cited this text within your manuscript. In terms of level of advance, can you please discuss this paper in your manuscript and clearly state the advances this manuscript offers over other related papers.

   *Reply by Busch et al:* Your point is well taken. However, the study you are referring to is based on a different patient cohort from a different institution and country (Johns Hopkins Hospital Baltimore vs. Charité Hospital Berlin). Furthermore, the endpoints investigated were functional outcome and not oncological outcome in the current study and solely oncological outcome in the Hopkins series. Therefore, comparison of the two studies is not feasible. No changes were made concerning this remark.

3. Plagiarism
   Further to your previously published manuscript in the *British Journal of Urology International* (PubMedID: 21044243), we can see that some phrases used in this published article also appear in the current manuscript. For example, in the Methods section and also the first line of the Discussion, which also appears in the above published paper. Please note that BioMed Central is a member of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) and as such, we do not tolerate any form of plagiarism. Please can you revise your manuscript to eliminate copied text.

   *Reply by Busch et al:* This is another important remark. Since Dr. Magheli published numerous papers based on prostate cancer databases, he certainly used similar phrases in the material and method section. We have changed and reworded the critical phrases in the revised version of our manuscript (methods section and first line of discussion section).

We hope that you now find the revised version of our manuscript suitable for undergoing a review process in order to be published in BMC Urology.

Yours sincerely

J. Busch and A. Magheli