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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Not entirely.
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes.
3. Are the data sound? Yes.
4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation? Yes.
5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes.
6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Not completely
7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes.
8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Yes.
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No.
10. Is the writing acceptable? It is marginal due to poor English

Review Comments:

The authors state that they have a paper looking at genital functional outcomes in males; the second half of the title does not really make sense to me. The 'purpose' states it is looking at local recurrence/ but that should be stated as a secondary (and important) endpoint of the paper.

Why was the length of stay longer in nerve preservation group?
Why did you not examine bladder function results? That would be quite interesting data to show.
What is the technique of PANP? please describe what specific steps are taken / technique of PANP

Overall, good paper with strong numbers. Please correct the multiple grammatical and spelling errors

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely
related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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