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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editors and reviewers:

We thank you very much for giving us an opportunity again to revise our manuscript. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval.

Reviewer reports:
Lu Yang (Reviewer 1): All comment have been adequately addressed. The paper is now suitable for publication on the BMC Urology
Response: Thanks for your comment.

Tommaso Cai, M.D. (Reviewer 2): My suggestions have been partially accepted. I suggest to insert your comment to referee on the retrospective nature of the study in the discussion, among study limitations.
Response: Thanks for your comment. We have indicated this limitation in last paragraph in Discussion part: This was a retrospective, open-label study and the sample size was small relative to clinical trials; there might be some inevitable bias due to the retrospective nature. A further prospective study would be required to reduce bias and increase the strength.
Mehmet Gokhan Culha (Reviewer 4): This is the revised version of a study which aims to investigate the factors influencing efficacy of dapoxetine for the treatment of premature ejaculation. The authors revised their manuscript in accordance with the recommendation of the reviewers thus improved its overall quality.

However, few minor issues remained unaddressed.

1- The authors should indicate if the linguistic validation of the PHQ-9 and GAD-7 questionnaires.

2- The authors should calculate the index PEP scores of the patients.
Response: Thanks for your comment. Regarding for these two questions,

(1) We have provided the references of linguistic validation of Chinese version of PHQ-9 and GAD-7 questionnaires.


(2 ) The PEP scores are composed of four questions: in the 1st and 2nd questions, patients with lower score would be judged as higher possibility of suffering from PE; while in the 3rd and 4th questions, patients with higher score would be considered as possible PE patients. Thus, in accordance with previous similar studies, we think it might not be quite useful to calculate the index PEP scores and hope for your understanding. We would like to make further revision should you think it’s important to list this information.

We appreciate reviewers very much for the positive and constructive comments and suggestions. Looking forward to hearing from you. Thank you again for your consideration and assessment.

Sincerely Yours
Jing Peng, Dong Fang
Peking University First Hospital