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The authors presented a case series of AUS surgeries from a cohort of Chinese patients with complex etiology. Of note, many of the patients had urethral reconstruction and urethroplasty. AUS is not commonly performed in China, and this experience will add to the urologic literature there. Overall the case series is well written with adequate details. A few minor questions:

1. page 13, line 10: "Patients with a history of urethral surgery will have higher rates of eventual AUS explantation for erosion and/or infection." Is this statement based on the author's own series here (no statistical analysis was presented), or is this based on published literature (no reference was provided). It appears to me, based on Table 2, many of the revision, explantation, erosion or infection were in the initial few patients (up to patient 7) but the later patients with history of urethroplasty did just fine. This may be a reflection of the learning curve needed to perfect the surgical techniques. We have previously published a paper that described the learning curve experience of the AUS:


2. page 12, line 1: "Considering aggressive false passage incision may cause more damage, we performed augmentation cystoplasty before AUS implantation." It is not clear what this means? Can you clarify what you intent to say and why you performed augmentation cystoplasty as a staged procedure prior to AUS implantation?

3. page 12, line 33: "This may explain the minority proportion of PPI patients in the present study." It is possible that the small number of PPI patients in the case series actually a reflection of the relatively small number of radical prostatectomy performed in China (compared to say, the United States), and/or a difference of referral pattern to your hospital (China Rehabilitation Research Center is a renowned hospital for neurogenic bladder and reconstruction), instead of the high PPI urinary continence rate claimed by the authors?
4. Further grammatical editing and proofreading is recommended, examples:

different places: staged procedure instead of "stage" procedure

page 2, line 38: maintained the original artificial urinary sphincter instead of the "primary" AUS

page 6, line 24, 17: one incision instead of one "cut"

page 10, line 33: undergone at least two surgeries instead of "twice" surgeries

page 10, line 37: "Of our concern"

page 13, line 49: a staged procedure instead of a "stage produce"
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