

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-23-266>

Reviewer A

Overall, the paper is well-written, and the study design is appropriate for the research question. The content is really informative for urologic surgeons who perform pelvic surgeries. Some improvements can be made to enhance the quality of the paper. Here are some minor specific comments:

1: minimally invasive surgeries (MIS) have been popular in pelvic surgeries these days. How rates are the MIS in this cohort? If you do not have any data about this, you should state this point in the limitation.

******MIS is not reliably coded in NSQIP and thus was not analyzed. It is addressed among the limitation in the last chapter of the discussion**

2: While the introduction provides a good background for the study, it would be helpful to provide a clear research question and hypotheses.

***** Added to the end of the introduction**

3: In the Methods section, the data selection section needs more detail. For example, the exclusion criteria for the patients should be clearly defined. Additionally, it is not clear how missing data were handled. Providing this information would improve the study's transparency and reproducibility.

*****Observations with missing data in any of the variables analyzed (except for gender and surgery) were included in the study but excluded for the analysis of the variable where the data was missing. For example, a patient with missing operative time was included in the study and had his data analyzed except where operative time was part of the analysis.**

It is added in the last piece of data section

Reviewer B

This paper was significant and can be acceptable.