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RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Dear Editors,

It is an honour to re-submit our manuscript entitled “Treatment approaches of recurrent anastomotic strictures following artificial urinary sphincter implantation.” for consideration for publication in JMCR. Your feedback was of most importance and it helped us to improve and clarify the manuscript as much as possible. In the following letter, we address to the comments of Reviewer 1, since the other 2 reviewers have no comments to address to. We hope that our paper will comply with the high standards of your journal. We look forward to your positive decision.

Stavros I. Tyritzis MD, PhD, FEBU

Corresponding author
Reviewer 1

1. The male sling has experienced resurgence over the last decade. The EAU Guidelines includes it as an option for surgical treatment of PPI. If the patient does not achieve acceptable continence with sling, placement of an AUS is not technically difficult or associated with altered efficacy.
Can the authors explain why they have not considered this alternative approach? It would be a good approach in an incontinent patient with a history of UVA strictures.

Actually, this was a patient with impotent sphincter and severe incontinence. The indication for a sling concerns patients with functioning sphincter and slight or moderate incontinence. Thus, there was no other option apart from the AUS placement at the first place. Moreover, the reason of our decision to implant an AUS was already reported in the discussion section of our manuscript.

2. The pictures are at very low resolution, could you modify them?

The Reviewer is absolutely right. We tried hard to provide the best we can with the available equipment at that time, which was not working properly. Unfortunately, these are the figures after every possible modification, which we acknowledge that are not satisfactory, but they give a perception of the situation.

Reviewer 2

Well written case report
Please format the manuscript according to the journal guidelines.

We thank the reviewer for his comments.

Reviewer 3

Very interesting case report. In fact, today we don't have algorithms and protocols in how to deal with these kind of strictures, combined with an AUS. This article also gives an alternative and interesting use of the semi-rigid URS. Indeed, we need a larger volume of cases in order to accept this approach.
We thank the reviewer for his comments. We agree that verification of this approach will come with larger series, but this event is extremely rare.