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Reviewer's report:

The submitted article is a systematic review to assess the impact of perineural invasion in prostatectomy specimen on biochemical recurrence.

Overall the article is well written but there are two major methodological issues and one major concern regarding the authors conclusion:

1) Overall only 222 articles were retrieved from the search with only 149 non-duplicates. This very low count demonstrates that the search strategy was not appropriate. This is supported by other published systematic reviews with similar topic.

2) Performing a Meta-analysis in a systematic review including only non-RCT’s is not appropriate.

3) The conclusion that patients with PNI might benefit from systemic treatment is not justifiable, as this systematic review does not assess the impact of PNI on overall survival/cancer specific survival. There is still a lack of data that even biochemical recurrence per se has an impact on these factors.

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.

No
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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