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**Reviewer's report:**

This is a retrospective study about the continence status of post-radical prostatectomy patients after the surgery, that happen between 2005 and 2010. The authors evaluate the patients and physician’s impression about the continence status, in order to find disparities. This is an important and actual issue that can improve the management of these patients, since it depends on a correct evaluation of the symptoms.

The abstract is OK.

The introduction is adequate and try to justify the need of the study. The aim is clear and well defined.

The methods are well described. In the second paragraph of the methods there are some information about results, that should be changed to the results section. The inclusion and exclusion criteria could be better described.

The results should include how many patients underwent radical prostatectomy during the period of the study in that institution, how many patients the authors try to contact (successfully or not) how many were excluded due to incomplete data on records and how many patients refuse to participate of the study.

I would like to see some points deeply commented in the discussion. The incontinence rate based on the patient perception was assessed nowadays, but it's an information about how these patients felt around 9 years ago. After this long time, maybe the patient’s impression could not be exact. The authors should discuss this potential bias.

In the first page of discussion, line 45, the authors should include a reference to justify the sentence. The authors should deeply discuss the discrepancy between patient’s subjective impression of continence status and questionnaire results.

Hope to see your answer and changes soon. Congratulation for this paper.
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