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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you so much for your letter informing me about my manuscript. Now I have revised it, do you think it fit your standard? If you have any problem to my manuscript please inform me at once, I will reply you prompt. I eagerly expect my manuscript can be published on your journal as quickly as possible.

I have changed some parts of my manuscript according to two reviewer's report. These are as follow:

To reviewer William Robertson

1. (1) We supplement those minor ingredients such as "calcium chloride dehydrate (0.1g/L), sodium oxalate (0.05g/L), and sodium citrate (0.01g/L)" used in the Artificial Urine

(2) The sentence "these ingredients can not be thoroughly dissolved" has been wrong writed. What we really want to say is that it is difficult to be dissolved, but could be dissolved as been heated. To make these questions clear, we proved some essential information of some ingredient used in our experiment which may be water content (as Table 3).

(3) we describe concentration of cations include in S1 or S2 as initial and added Na+, K+, Ca2+. We do not to describe the concentrations of diluted solutions S1 and S2 for we think the cations involved in these solutions will be diluted correspondingly. The pH values of diluted S1 and S2 will no detectable change for the ions, both cations and anions were diluted according their ratio. We only added these cations in initial S1 or S2 for we think it no use to our test solutions adding them in all other solutions or at various pH values and dilutions.

2. I have constructed another table (Table 4) to showing the final concentrations of cations in test solutions S1 and S2. The pH of S1 and S2 has no detectable change for they buffer solutions, adding minor cations could not cause enough pH change. Diluted according different ratio also cannot cause pH change for all ions, both cations and anions, were diluted correspondingly.

3. I would make further interpretation as your comment. S1 and S2 all make approximately the same injury to urinary tract. These injury maybe tolerated by the urinary tract. We will do further study to detect them.

Minor Essential Revisions:

1. In Table 2, the data we expressed are mean +/- SD.

2. We have revised Fig 2 as use different style and colour. But I don't know if it is clear enough to be used.

To reviewer Michale E Moran

1. Yes, we must obey this that most solutions involving in urinary stone dissolution cause harm to patients.
We will make further interpretation in our manuscript.

2. We have rewritten this sentence as "All these technologies have made good works in the treatment of phosphate calculi. But their injury to the urinary tissue, the remnant of stone fragment and the recurrence continues to be a serious problem in the treatment." In fact, what we mean is these new technologies could not do everything, so further study is need to found more simple and harmless therapy.

3. We removed sentence 5 in the introduction for we think it is not useful to my manuscript.

4. Dissolution through chemolysis has fallen into a limited role because most solutions used to dissolve phosphate stone cause serious harm to patients. We describe this as "But the injury to urothelial refrain their widely use." At the bottom of page 4.


Page 20th , Table 2, insert " \\
Page 23rd , Table 5, "x+/-s" to " \\

Thank you so much for review my manuscript, your data do me a favor in the process of revise it. I have learned a lot in your comments. I would prefer I can learn more from you.

With best regards
Sincerely yours.
Zhang Xiangbo

Dear Editor

Thank you so much for your letter informing me about my manuscript. Now I have revised it, do you think it fit your standard? If you have any problem to my manuscript please inform me at once, I will reply you prompt. I eagerly expect my manuscript can be published on your journal as quickly as possible.

I changed some parts of my manuscript according to two reviewer's report. These are as follow:

Title page:

1. I have changed the author's superscript numbers as Arabic numeral "1, 2, 3, ..."delete two of our authorsSun Hai-shuang Wang Liu-fang

2. Adding "Institute of Urology, The 2nd affiliated Hospital of Lanzhou University, LanZhou, 730030, China .E-mail: wzpurol@yahoo.com. Tel: 0931-8942498 Fax: 0931-8942498. Post address: 730030" To Correspondence to: Professor Wang Zhi-ping

3. Adding other authors E-mail follow 2

4. Revise the footnote. Adding full name before their institute correspondingly. Delete " LanZhou Medical College", Adding "Correspondence to: Professor Wang Zhi-ping"

Abstract:

1. Change "hour" to "h"
2. 16th line, delete "were", add "At"
3. 19th line, "added" to "at"
4. 23rd line, insert "pH 8.5"

5. Page 3, Change all forms as "S1 (5.05 +/- 0.15) mg/hr" to "(5.05 +/- 0.15) mg/hr (S1)"
6. 3rd line, adding "", 6th , 11th line as the same.
7. 7th line, change "Following" to "As", add "was" after "value".
8. 9th line, add "As diluted twice".
9. 11th line, add" (p<0.05, S1 and S2 vs R)"
10. 16th line, add "Their twice diluted", "are even more"

Introduction:
1. Page 4, 11th line, delete "On the other.......the rate of recurrence"
2. 20th line, revise [2-4]
3. Page 5, 1st line, "effective" to "effect", " solution" to " solutions", "is" to "are"
4. 2nd line, "effectivness" to "effectiveness"

Material and methods
1. Page 6, 16th line, adding "molecular formula and their molecular weight of some drugs used in these solvents as Table 3." Construct a table (Table 3).
2. 23rd line, supplement data in Art as "calcium chloride dehydrate (0.1g/L), sodium oxalate (0.05g/L), and sodium citrate (0.01g/L)."
3. Page 7, 13th line, rewrite as" the concentration of these ingredients as Table 4"
4. 17th line as the same as 3
5. 19th line, insert Table 4
6. 21st line, change "1 N..." to "mmol/L" as "302.7mmol/L"
7. Page 8, revise "dehydrate" to "anhydrous"

Result:
1. Page 10, 11th line, insert "R, S1 and S2"
2. 13th line, "hour" to "h", 15th line as the same
3. 16th line, revise as "aP<0.01 Phys, Art and EDTA vs R, S1 and S2. bP<0.05 EDTA vs S1, S2 and R. cP<0.05 R vs S1."
4. 19th line, insert "Table 5"
5. 22nd line, insert "1mol/L", "10 ml"
6. 23rd line insert "100ml"
7. Page 11, 5th line, "Fig 2"
8. 9th line, rewrite as "cause no significant change to their dissolution rate"
9. 11th line, rewrite as "Test of diluted solutions"
10. 12th line, "double" to "twice". insert "effectiveness of", "have been" to "are"
11. 14th line, rewrite as "( , P<0.05, S1 and S2 vs R). The effect of"

Discussion:

Page 12

1. 4th line, Rewrite as "Chemolysis is useful for eliminating cystine stones as well as for cases in which lithotripsy or endourology is considered difficult or risky. It proved to be a useful method for reducing staghorn stones before performing lithotripsy [6]."
2. 8th line, insert "and must be regarded as an effective adjuvant treatment [7]."
3. 19th line, insert "but a contradicted conclusion has been made by a Dutch study [11] that magnesium in R may promote stone dissolution by cation exchange with calcium in apatite [12]."
4. Page 13, 7th line, insert "(P<0.05, S1 and S2 vs R)."
5. 10th line, insert "So we think twice diluted S1 and S2 may be useful than their initial solution."
6. Page 14, 2nd line, insert "S1 and S2 cause no significant change to their dissolution rate."

Conclusion

1. Page 15, line 3 insert "especially while be twice diluted."
11th line, insert "Author declare:
We declare that we have no competing interests."
2. 14th line, insert "Author contribution:
Zhang Xiangbo carried out the experiment, participated in the sequence alignment in the design of the study, performed the statistical analysis and drafted the manuscript. Duan Jian-min, Lu Jianzhong, Ma Baoliang participated in the sequence alignment. Wang Zhiping conceived of the study, and participated in its design and coordination and helped to draft the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Reference:
1. Page 17, 21st line, insert "Suby RM"
2. Page 18, 3rd line, insert "-91"
5. 9th line, insert "Fig list:

1. Fig. 1 Dissolution rate of phosphate calculi in vitro at 24 h and 72 h use different solutions. Phys = physiologic sodium chloride solution, pH 7.0. Art = artificial urine, pH 5.7. EDTA=0.03M disodium EDTA+TEA, pH 8.5. R = renacidin, pH 4.0. S 1 = test solution 1, pH 4.0. S 2 = test solution 2, pH 3.9. aP<0.01 vs Phys and Art. bP>0.05 vs EDTA, Phys and Art. cP<0.05 vs R. x+/-s. n=18 for each group. For statistic, see results section.

2. Fig. 2 Effectiveness of six solvents at different pH (mg/hr). Phys = physiologic sodium chloride solution, Art = artificial urine, EDTA=0.03M disodium EDTA+TEA, R = renacidin, S1 = test solution 1, S2 = test solution 2.

3. Fig. 3 Concentration and effective of S1 and S2"

6 Page 21st, insert "Table 3"

7. Page 22nd, insert "Table 4"