

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-22-809>

Reviewer A:

Comment 1: This is a very nice case series and I think provides some data in an area where none exist and offers the opportunity for hypothesis-generation.

I would get rid of the first 2 paragraphs - they don't add to your specific purpose and readers of this article will likely have the basic understanding of the AUS already.

Reply 1: I got rid of these two paragraphs.

Comment 2: I would comment on - if you can - how patients were managed with asymptomatic erosions while they awaited explantation. Were they put on antibiotics? Also can you comment on whether, at the time of removal, any infection or worsened erosion was noted?

Reply 2: I added comments on this in the case description and the discussion.

Comment 3: Otherwise I think this is a well-written paper and worth publishing to provide some data in an area that is otherwise a data desert!

Reviewer B:

Comment: The authors present a small retrospective case series of patients with delayed management of artificial urinary sphincter cuff erosion. This study is tempered by multiple important limitations. These patients did not undergo device explantation due to other reasons and not due to the decision of the urologist. Moreover, this study did not report any methods. How will this study help clinical practice? Importantly, the authors did not provide any figures and any tables of the findings. It would have been interesting to see the endoscopic figures of patients with erosion.

Reply: I do not have a great picture of an erosion for this case series, but I Agree it would be nice.