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This study is a retrospective study on men underwent laparoscopic or robotic-assisted radical prostatectomy and evaluates the effect of PSM on outcome.

They concluded that, in comparison to patients with negative surgical margins, those with PSM do not translate into worse medium-term oncological outcomes in the majority of cases amongst our cohort. The relevance of PSM is controversial and I think the study could give some contribution to minimize the importance of PSM for outcome prediction. The study is in general well designed. However, it is uncertain, whether the authors have already applied an FDR-adjusted P-values for comparison analyses. Furthermore, the inclusion of 7 parameters with categories in multivariate cox regression analyses on 592 pts. can limit the strength of such multivariate analyses and should be therefore reconsidered. Did the authors perform a univariate cox regression analysis?

Table 2 is not clear whether the regression analysis is univariate or multivariate.
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