

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Reviewer Comments:

I was pleased to review the article - Urinary Tract Injury During Hysterectomy: Does Surgeon Specialty and Surgical Volume Matter? The methodology used by the authors is appropriate for the purpose of the study and conclusions are narrowly linked to available evidence. The title expresses clearly the content of the manuscript and highlights the importance of the study In general, the manuscript may benefit from some revisions, as suggested below:

-It doesn't seem representative to me that surgeon subspecialty should be a Keywords

I have removed “surgeon subspeciality” from the Keywords section

- the ABSTRACT section is very laborious, I recommend that section Background should be shorter

I have shortened the background section to reflect only important and pertinent points to the study.

- the INTRODUCTION section is very laborious, here are a lot of details and references which would find its place, better, in the discussion section

I have shortened the introduction section and only kept relevant points to the aim of our study. I have moved information regarding surgery modality, etc to the discussion section where it is more fitting.

-I suggest a revision of the References, because references should not include the month in which an article was published

I have revised the references in AMA format and they no longer include the month of article publication. I have also updated the references to reflect the shortened introduction, as some references are no longer included in the manuscript.

- The results are presented clearly and accurately and are consistent with the aim of the work and the methods. All the relevant data have been included in the article. The data described in the text are consistent with the data in the tables. The limitations of the study also have been described very well, there were a lot of surgeons (42) of which only one urogynecologist. Maybe it would be interesting to add/discuss how the urologic injury were diagnosed and how they manifested (time since surgery, clinical manifestations...) This publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice

I appreciate this evaluation and have minimally changed these sections, as there were no suggestions to do so.