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Author’s response to reviews:

Point by point revision

Dear editors and professors:

Thanks very much for your advice. According to your suggestions, we revised the manuscript. The point-by-point revision is listed below.

Demetrius H Bagley (Reviewer 1)

1) Abstract: What we compared between two groups were listed.

2) Background:

a) I introduced the thulium laser briefly in the background, and it would be compared with some other techniques in the discussion section.

b) The sentence “32 case of ureteral carcinoma treated by…”was changed into “32 cases of upper tract urothelial carcinomas”.
3) Methods
   a) Spelling mistakes were corrected.

   b) D-J stent was used in our study.

   c) The stent was usually removed 3 months later for decreasing the rate of ureteral stricture.

4) Results
   The sentence was changed to “4 patients developed ureteral stricture 3 months after operation, which was successfully treated by stenting, balloon dilatation, or laser incision successfully”.

5) Discussion
   a) In the discussion, I mentioned that dialysis usually led to a poor outcome in older people. So “the age of 61” was to emphasize that this is especially in older people.

   b) Some other techniques such as holmium and neodymium lasers which are also widely used were described in the discussion section.

   c) ”guiding zebra” was changed to “zebra guide wire”.

   d) Long-term studies of endoscopically managed UTUC are rarely reported. In the discussion section, a systematic reviewed was added to reflect the recurrence to some extent.

   e) I removed the word of “stage” The histology and grade could usually be determined urteroscopically.
f) Actually, it has some limitation when judging the tumor visually, and we clarified this in the last two sentences in the first paragraph of the discussion section.

6) Spelling, grammar errors and the reference form were corrected.

Adam Gadzinski, MD, MS (Reviewer 2)

Title: The title was changed into “Treatment of upper tract urothelial carcinoma with ureteroscopy and thulium laser: a retrospective single center study”.

1) Study design:


Methods:

a) The sentence has been changed into “After obtaining approval by the Committee of medical records department”.

b) Data of the Laser group were compared with 107 consecutive RNU cases in the same period, which were operated by open bladder cuff in 83, endoscopic bladder cuff resection in 24.

c) I am so sorry about the spelling and grammar errors. They have been corrected now as possible as I can. No patients were died of Upper tract urothelial carcinomas directly. However, We did not have the precise data about median recurrence time and Kaplan-Meier.
4) Results: Actually, in our study, the laser group showed a higher recurrence rate when compared with RNU group.

a) The recurrence include not only upper tract urothelial carcinomas but also bladder cancer.

c) Metastatic occurred in 9 of RUN group.

5) Discussion: Long-term studies of endoscopically managed UTUC are rarely reported. In the discussion section, a systematic reviewed was added to reflect the recurrence to some extent.

6) We examined our study and corrected the errors raised.

7) We emphasized the thulium laser in the background and discussion sections. This study may provide the experience of treating UTUC endoscopically, especially the use of thulium laser, which was mentioned in the article.

8) Thirdly, some patients were made nephroureterectomy even after many years of follow-up because of progressive disease.

9) We are sorry about the errors we made in English and they have been corrected as possible as I can.

Thank you for all your effort and give my respect to Dr Bagley and Dr Gadzinski.
Sincerely

Pro Jin Wen
wjpumch@163.com

Pro Zhi G Ji
jzgjxmc@163.com