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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1) In your paper you talk about the using of validated questionnaires but you don't mentions the name of them. So it is important to know which for erectile disfunction and which for continence.

2) In the text you talk about preoperative outcomes. Usually we have preoperative data and postoperative outcomes. An outcome is defined as something that comes after.

3) There is no mention about the cut off, due to validated questionary score, that you used to put your decision to perform a nerve sparing or a non nerve sparing surgery. We know that normally a nerve sparing surgery has a bigger blood loss. So I think you should divide a nerve sparing group and a non nerve sparing group. This may help to have a more homogeneous result.

4) As the core point is the posterior surgical approach, I think that a better explanation about the technique is mandatory.

5) You say that you measured the postoperative continence rate using a validated questionary but in your table 2 it seems you validate the continence just with the pads counting.

6) If it is a stress urinary incontinency I think you should mention it.

7) If you have data about the PSA at the follow-up, why don't put them.

Minor Essential Revisions:
1) In the Table 2 maybe interesting to have also the 1 month continency data.

2) If you have a 11.5 months follow-up might be useful to have longer data about continence (more than the 6 months collected).

3) Above the "functional outcomes" I think that the last sentence "...however, the continence...ecc...ecc" should be better explained. For example "however the continence rate was similar in all the groups after 6 months".

4) Whenever you say "positive margin" may be better to say "positive marginS".

Discretionary Revisions:
1) The bibliography note 4 appear late in the text seeming you forgot to put it before. Better to control
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