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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Jing Zhang

The comments of the editor and the reviewer have been helpful in allowing us to revise and strengthen our manuscript (Application of hyaluronic acid/carboxymethyl cellulose membrane for early continence after nerve-sparing robot-assisted radical prostatectomy, BURO-D-18-00303R1). The detailed review of our manuscript was much appreciated. We have attempted to address all of the questions raised by the editor and the reviewer and have also included additional data as required.

Thank you for your kind consideration of the revised version.

Yours sincerely,

Nobuyuki Hinata, M.D.
To the editor:

1. Authors’ contributions

Please note that based on the current authors’ contributions section, MF does not automatically qualify for authorship. As general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

We ask that you ensure that author contributions are in line with the ICMJE guidelines (below), and that all listed authors have performed all four points specified below:

A. Made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;

B. Been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content;

C. Given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content; and

D. Agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Please provide more information on individual author contributions and ensure author contributions listed in the authors’ contribution section are reflective of ICMJE guidelines.

For any authorship changes, we request that a Change in Authorship form be filled out. The change in authorship form can be found from the link on the following page:

https://resource-cms.springernature.com/springer-cms/rest/v1/content/7454878/data/v5

All instructions can be found on the form, please treat the 'current authorship' section as the original authorship.

Answer: MF made substantial contributions to conception and design and also was involved in drafting the manuscript. These corrections have been made in the authors’ contribution section (page 23, lines 11 and 14).
2. Email address

As we note email address of the corresponding author listed on the title page of this manuscript is inconsistent to that mentioned in the editorial submission system, please check this and ensure the author’s information is matched.

Answer: The email address registered in the editorial submission system was the corresponding author’s second email address. The correct email address (hinata@med.kobe-u.ac.jp) has been registered in the EditorialManager.

3. Keywords

Please place the Keywords section to below the Abstract in the main text of this manuscript.

Answer: According to the editor’s instruction, Keywords section has been moved to below the Abstract in the main text of the manuscript.

4. Clean copy

On uploading your revisions, please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript. Please also remove ‘Response Letter.docx’ from the file inventory as it is no longer required at this stage.

Answer:

According to the editor’s instruction, tracked changes or highlighting have been removed. Also, ‘Response Letter.docx’ has been removed from the file inventory.
Reviewer #2:

I have reviewed the revised manuscript. My questions have been answered adequately. The authors have done nice research to improve continence outcomes.

The continence outcomes of the nonHA/CMC groups are to my opinion lower than the standard you could find in literature.

Answer: We agree with the reviewer’s opinion. Reasons of the rather low continence outcomes of the non-HA/CMC groups in the present study might be ascribed to the strict continence definition used and the fact that not all the four surgeons were experts. According to the reviewer’s comment, these reasons have been added to the discussion section (page 20, lines 3-5).

The real mechanism of improvement of continence by use of HA/CMC remains not clearly understood.

I think further research on this topic and its working mechanism is needed before concluding too early that use of this membrane is improving early continence anyway.

Answer: We agree with the reviewer. Thus we revised the conclusion section to include that further researches on this working mechanism is warranted (page 21, line 5).