Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Major revision
Specific Comments to Authors: I have the following comments and questions. 1. The authors reported that 18% of patients complied with the original PROM and 91% complied with the modified PROM. How many patients initially complied to the original PROM now complied with the modified PROM? How many patients initially not complied to the original PROM now complied with the modified PROM? How many patients did not comply with both PROMs? 2. The authors reported data on stricture recurrence rate, urinary flow rate, and complications that some of the patients experienced. The authors should try to correlate these with satisfaction about urinary flow, sexual function and quality of life. 3. The first 3 sentences of the Conclusion section with reference 11 should be put in the Discussion section instead. The Conclusion should include a statement of summary of the result, such as that the modified PROM with 3 key questions had a very high compliance rate. 4. The authors should also tabulate the relationship between sexual function and urinary flow to assess their correlation, similar to Tables 1 and 2.

Response: Thank you for your comments. I have added another table to reflect the change in compliance rates in the people who complied, or did not comply with the original PROM and how that changed with the modified PROM (see table 1). I have also added another table (Table 4) to demonstrate the relationship between urinary flow and sexual function as requested. I have moved the first 3 sentences from the conclusion to the discussion and I have included a statement summary of the result in the conclusion as well. I hope I have addressed all of your points.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Major revision
Specific Comments to Authors: Abstract is missing. It is not clear if the same number of men were subjected to the original PROM and modified PROM. Please be explicit and mention how many patients completed each questionnaire. It is well-known that compliance for long questionnaires is poor. Does your questionnaire have only 3 questions? Can you attach your modified questionnaire as an Annexure? These questionnaires are mostly used for research purposes to compare and present data. Will your modification be adequate in that regards? While you mention that the compliance improved. However, did the questionnaire loose its efficacy?

Response: Thank you for your comments. I have added in the Abstract for the paper. I have also clearly stated how many patients were invited to participate in the original PROM as compared to the modified PROM and added a table (Table 1) of just the original patients who participated in both. I have attached a copy of the modified PROM as a figure (Figure 1). I have also added a few sentences at the end of the discussion to address your last comment about the efficacy. Yes, we agree that this abridged 3-question PROM does lose some of its efficacy in patient evaluation, however, we posit that it can be used as more of a screening tool to identify the patients who have a poor outcome, and who require a more in-depth assessment. A screening tool that is quick to perform with high compliance ensures increased patient participation and therefore a more accurate assessment of patient satisfaction. I hope I have addressed all of your points and happy to discuss further.