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Reviewer's report:

I want to congratulate the authors for the big effort performing this systematic review.

Major comments: In the background you stated :" to our knowledge there is no systematic review that pools the oncological outcomes and compares the new technique with the conventional inter-fascail approach but one of the publications cyted in your paper : Weng et al Intrafascial versus interfascial nerve sparing in radical prostatectomy for localized prostate cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis, Scientific Reports, 2017 is a systematic review and meta-analysis of Sep 2017 that assessed both functional and oncological outcomes of the 2 different techniques you analyzed driving to the same oncological results just one year ago.

When you perform a systematic review you should follow the PRISMA protocol : you should register your review in a registry such as PROSPERO and provide a registration number. You should clearly identify who is the guarantor of the review.

You should Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO), ideally with a table.

In the methods section you should Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review.

Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage ( in your study you didn't specify if the studies included were prospected, retrospectives, RCT ?).

Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated (you didn't specify the search strategy so that it can be repeated, but just mentioning the words you used without logical connectives).

Minor comments:

Why is this paper not been added to the analysis ? Ihsan-Tasci et al. Oncologic results, functional

The ideal for the analysis should be to exclude retrospective studies

Minor comments

Please confirm that you have included your review in the ‘Comments to Author’ box?
As a minimum standard, please include a few sentences that outline what you think are the authors’ hypothesis/objectives, their main results, and the conclusions drawn. Your report should constructively instruct authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable for publication, or provide detailed reasons as to why the manuscript does not fulfill our criteria for consideration. Please supply appropriate evidence using examples from the manuscript to substantiate your comments. Please break your comments into two bulleted or numbered sections: major and minor comments.

Please note that we may not be able to use your review if no comments are provided.

Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included as text in the ‘Comments to Author’ box.

Yes

Are the methods appropriate and well described to allow independent reproduction of experiments?
Please state in the ‘Comments to Authors’ box below what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods (study design, data collection, and data analysis), and what is required, if anything, to improve the quality of reporting

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

NA

Are you able to assess the statistics?
- Are the statistical test(s) used in this study appropriate and well described?

- Is the exact sample size (n) reported for each experimental group/condition (as a number, not a range)?

- Are the description of any error bars and probability values appropriate?

- Are all error bars defined in the corresponding figure legends?
- Has a sample size calculation been included, or a description and rationale about how sample sizes were chosen?

Please can you confirm which of the following statements apply to your statistical assessment of the manuscript (Please include details of what the authors need to address in the ‘Comments to Author’ box):

There are statistical tests that I am unable to assess and recommend seeking additional advice (please specify which tests these are in the ‘Comments to Editor’ box)

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

Yes

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

Acceptable

Should the manuscript be highlighted for promotional activity?
Articles that are deemed of interest to a broad audience can be promoted in a variety of ways. This could be through email updates, postings on the BioMed Central homepage, social media, blogs and/or press releases. Please indicate in the text box below whether you think this manuscript should be considered for promotional activity, indicating your reasons why (e.g. what is the most newsworthy aspect of the research).

No

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal