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Reviewer's report:

Jian and colleagues performed a systematic review and meta-analysis to assess post-operative differences among men undergoing robotic prostatectomy with a urethral catheter vs suprapubic catheter. Among 7 studies and 946 patients, there was a difference in men having a suprapubic catheter with regards to improvement in bother/discomfort at post-operative Day 7.

This is a well-done study assessing differences between urethral and suprapubic catheter use after robotic prostatectomy. Although not particularly strong studies identified during the systematic review, the authors have appropriately analyzed the available literature. I have a few recommendations for perhaps improving the manuscript:

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.

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

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.

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.

Unable to assess
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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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