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I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 9 criteria for evaluation in the journal: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Your case report is interesting in the era of ever expanding indications of laparoscopy. I have a few comments and suggestions.

Since this is a report about a surgical technique in a complex anatomic presentation, you need to provide some more details that I feel might help other urologists when they encounter a similar situation.

1. Can you provide some more details about the anatomy of the crossing vessels in relation to the entire duplicated system (both moieties). What was the relation of the crossing vessels to the upper moiety ureter and did you have to deal with this in any particular manner during your procedure for repairing the lower moiety obstruction.

2. Do you think, in your opinion, there are any possible technical differences between laparoscopic pyeloplasty for lower moiety UPJ obstruction in your patient as compared to laparoscopic pyeloplasty for upper moiety obstruction (previously published report)

3. What was your technique of ureteral stent insertion during the surgery.
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