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Reviewer's report:

Dear Author,

I've read very carefully your manuscript entitled "Combined bladder neck preservation and posterior musculofascial reconstruction during robotic assisted radical prostatectomy: effects on early and long term urinary continence recovery." I've found it interesting but I think it needs some major review.

Here are my reasons:

1- First of all I think there is a weak-point in method. Why you have matched 3 different robotic techniques (Walsh, Montsouris and RARP with BNP following Rocco modified by Ceolho)? Can this be a bias? Explain this point trying to clarify that this match is possible.

2- You reported the number of patients in materials and methods section. This is a mistake it has to be reported in results. In "Patients and methods" you talk about median values and standard deviations: this sentence should be in the results. Also in abstract you consider 232 patients while in the manuscript 292. Moreover in the Abstract, specifically in the results subsection you don't specify some important results such as "no statistically significant differences were found between the simple RARP and the RRP+BNP groups". Please correct.

3- In materials and methods section you wrote "RRP + BNS". What is BNS? explain this abbreviation

4- I didn't find the location of the study. Is it a single center study or not?

5- The follow-up period and the number of patients involved in this retrospective study were good, as well as the result of 0% of positive margins found in patients undergoing BNP. Is it correct?
6- in my opinion, weigh the decision not to use an objective pre-operative evaluation of continence in patients undergoing radical prostatectomy; It would be helpful and commendable to evaluate bladder compliance, maximum urethral closure pressure and the bladder outlet obstruction with a basic urodynamic examination; a good comment on this could be advisable.

7- you could implement a grade of bladder neck preservation during RARP in the wake of the study of Lee Z et al " Functional and oncologic outcomes of graded bladder neck preservation during robot-assisted radical prostatectomy. " J Endourol .... or at least leave a comment on this.

8- In table 1 you entered the average age and BMI table using the same column (RARP BNP + Prec and RARP). In the same table you should express the percentage values in such a way as to make the table more readable.

9- A look from a native English speaker is desirable in order to improve the fluency.

10- 10 - You have not considered whether patients have made radiotherapy after surgery. Please add a comment.
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