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Comments to the editor:

This retrospective study aims to explore the role of ileal ureter replacement as a reconstructive technique applied in Chinese patients with long ureteral injuries. The series is composed from 23 patients who underwent this procedure by a single surgeon between 2010-2015, and the authors reviewed the medical history, indications for surgery, operative data; perioperative data and outcomes. The manuscript is clearly written, presents the surgical technique and the post-operative outcomes in details, and eventually concludes that "Ileal ureter replacement is an efficacious and safe procedure for the therapy of long ureteral defects".

Review of the literature reveals that throughout the last more than 100 years, elapsed from its first introduction, the technique of ileal ureteral replacement is already well established and has been widely discussed relating to various technical and clinical aspects. In accordance, the present manuscript in its current version does not really bring any remarkable renewing messages concerning this issue.

The manuscript might be significantly improved if the following steps will be followed:

- Defining clearly the aim of the study.
  At present, the reader might get the impression that it aims to "present a retrospective experience among Chinese patients with long ureteral injuries".

I doubt whether the authors really meant that this population is different from others such as African, Caucasian etc., and eventually intended to focus on its uniqueness regarding the clinical presentation, surgical course and post-operative outcome,..

- Giving the precise clinical data regarding the patients included in the study, including the exact position and the measured length of the damaged ureter.
In the literature*, it is clearly stated that the procedure should be spared for "Delayed ureteral repairs, especially when a very long segment of ureter is destroyed...". In the present series, the injuries were limited to the proximal-mid ureter (8), mid ureter (2), distal-mid distal (8) and in the full length only in 5 cases. A detailed description of the severity of the damage might rule out the possible suspension of over-usage of this technique, even in cases, which might have been corrected by simpler procedures.

- Focusing on the surgical technical aspects of the procedure, mainly on the implication of the anti-reflux reimplantation of the ureters in the vast majority of the cases and on the consequent advantages.

A stronger message regarding the possible superiority of the anti-reflux reimplantation of the ureteral segment is important as it is recognized in the literature* that "No sufficient clinical data exist to establish the superiority of a tapered segment, a nonrefluxing anastomosis, or a shorter, segmental replacement over a standard ileal substitution".
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