Reviewer’s report

Title: Suprapubic Tube Versus Urethral Catheter Drainage after Robot-Assisted Radical Prostatectomy: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Version: 0 Date: 22 Nov 2017

Reviewer: Mark Ball

Reviewer's report:

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 speaker's 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.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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