

TRANSLATIONAL ANDROLOGY AND UROLOGY

Peer Review File

Article Information: Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-20-749>

Review Comments:

- Please correct the use of comma as decimal point.

Our response: The decimal presentations has been unified

- Please also use a uniform spelling for the representation of p-values, especially regarding the decimal places (also in figures).

Our response: The p values and decimal presentations has been unified. All p values lower than 0.001 were presented as “p<0.001”

- Please correct °C in line 228.

Our response: the symbol was corrected

- In the abstract you state that (line 35) „The gold standard for TURB is monopolar TURB (mTURB)“, also in the introduction you claim that (line 66) „... (TUR-B is) classically performed with monopolar current (mTURB)“. Do you have proof for these statements? There are reports to the contrary.

Our response: The statement in the abstract has been softened. The second statement stays that TURB was conventionally performed with monopolar (which is an indisputable truth), and that when compared to other modalities (e.g. enbloc) – it is a standard of care.

- Later, you state that (line 215) „Originally, TURB was performed with monopolar electrocautery“ which makes it sound like an ancient technique. How does that fit together? What current does the majority use?

Our response: The statement has been softened. As widely known, each centre and each individual surgeon has its own preferences regarding the type of cautery. It is even more true as EAU guidelines are very curt in recommendations about this matter. Because of that it is not possible to state what does majority use.

TRANSLATIONAL ANDROLOGY AND UROLOGY

- Is there a reason why you set the threshold of I2 to <50%? For example, why not <30%?

Our response: We set the threshold of I2 to < 50 %, because according to Cochrane handbook I2 between 50 % and 90 % may represent substantial heterogeneity. In vast majority of meta-analyses, I2 < 50 % is preferred and predominantly used threshold, considered as not significant heterogeneity among studies.

- In your figures you show differences as „mean difference“ whereas it is a weighted mean difference.

Our response: In the software we used (Rev Man 5.3), it is impossible to edit this heading. However, pooling raw data (mean + SD) in RevMan is always weighted by the precision of the study ((it corresponds to inverse variance analysis (IV)), and weights are presented in separate column.

- Did you register the review in PROSPERO?

Our response: This meta-analysis was not registered in PROSPERO system.

- Did you create the manuscript using the PRISMA checklist? Please provide a summary of findings table.

Our response: Yes, the paper was created according to PRISMA guidelines. The details are attached in accessory files.