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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editors and reviewers,

Many thanks for your letter and for the reviewers’ insightful comments concerning our manuscript. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made corrections which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:

1) The systematic literature search was performed in June 2016 -- this is nearly 1.5 years ago. The authors need to update the systematic search to ensure no other studies have been published in the past 18 months have been missed.

Response:

We did the literature search again, and we did find 1 related studies in this field. However, the data from that study cannot rolled in our current meta-analysis. Because the data were not shown as numeric but in figure. Thus, we can extract the mean score of postoperative pain, but we cannot extract the standard deviation. We now add the additional information of this new study
in the discussion part. We also update the information of figure 1. (Result section, page 6, line 12-21).

2) Results - for each outcome assessed, the author's should explicitly state the number of patient's and studies used for the outcome.

Response:

It is a good idea for improving the quality of our manuscript. It really helped the general readers to interpret the result. We add the information in the revision. (Result section, page 7 to 8).

3) Results - for the urinary incontinence, BNC and ED visit/complications sections, the authors should refrain from referencing/discussing other studies in the Results section. This is good information, its just that it should be in the Discussion and not in the Results.

Response:

We moved the urinary incontinence, BNC and ED visit/complications section in the result section to discussion section. Thank you for your advice. (Discussion section, page 10, line 5.) (Discussion section, page 11, line 1.) (Discussion section, page 11, line 14)

Mark Ball (Reviewer 2): This submission is a systemic review and meta-analysis for urethral catheter vs suprapubic tube for after RP, including 3 retrospective studies, 1 prospective non-randomized study and 3 RCTs. The outcomes of POD1 pain, POD 6-7 pain, catheter bother, and urinary continence were evaluated. The authors found that bother favored suprapubic tube while none of the other outcomes differed. The manuscript could benefit from a native English speakers review. Several sentences are awkward (e.g. "So it might be a good choice to place a ST after RARP.")

Overall, this study may provide small incremental value compared to the single studies alone.

Response: We reviewed our manuscript again, and re-wrote some of our sentences which might help in improving the quality. Thank you for your advice! (whole manuscript).
Overall, thank you so much for taking your precious time on revising and pointing out the mistakes that occurred in our manuscript. This is also a very valuable fortune to me! I learnt a lot following your suggestions!

We appreciate for editors and reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Kunjie Wang

Dec. 10,2017