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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Presentations, diagnoses and/or management of new and emerging diseases

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

I have reviewed the manuscript.

The authors present an interesting and well exposed case report on the management of recurrent urethrovessical strictures following the implantation of the AUS.

I have the following comments for the authors:

1. The male sling has experienced resurgence over the last decade. The EAU Guidelines includes it as an option for surgical treatment of PPI. If the patient does not achieve acceptable continence with sling, placement of an AUS is not
technically difficult or associated with altered efficacy.

Can the authors explain why they have not considered this alternative approach? It would be a good approach in an incontinent patient with a history of UVA strictures.

2.
The pictures are at very low resolution, could you modify them?
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