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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to the Editor and the Reviewers

Dear Hayley Henderson:

Thank you very much for your letter and the comments about our paper (BSUR-D-19-00208R2) submitted to BMC Surgery. We deeply appreciate the careful reading of our manuscript and valuable suggestions from both the editor and the reviewers.

After carefully studying the comments and advice. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:
Editor Comments:

1. Please ensure the corresponding author listed in the manuscript file matches the corresponding author listed in the submission system - currently they differ.

We deeply appreciate the reviewer’s reminder. Both Professor Changying Xing and Professor Ningning Wang were listed as co-corresponding authors. The first author (Jing Wang) submitted the paper and approve the paper under their agreement.

2. In the section 'Funding', please also describe the role of the funding body/bodies in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

We do appreciate these constructive suggestions. We have added the content in the “Funding” section, on page 12, line 2 to line 7. Please see as follows:

This work was funded by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81270408, 81570666) supported the cost of the biochemical examination. International Society of Nephrology (ISN) Clinical Research Program (18-01-0247) supported the cost of design and collection and analysis of data. Construction Program of Jiangsu Provincial Clinical Research Center Support System (BL2014084) supported the cost of the imaging and pathological examination of TC before and after surgery, Jiangsu Province Key Medical Personnel Project (ZDRCA2016002) supported the cost of Post-PTX follow-up and interpretation of data.

3. Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship

(http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship).

Currently, the contributions of some of the authors do not automatically qualify them for authorship. In the section “Authors’ contributions”, please provide further clarifications on their contributions, and see our guidelines for authorship below. An ‘author’ is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. Authors are expected to fulfil the criteria below (adapted from McNutt et al., Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Feb 2018, 201715374; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1715374115; licensed under CC BY 4.0): Each author is expected to have made substantial contributions to the conception OR design of the work; OR the acquisition, analysis, OR interpretation of data; OR the creation of new software used in the work; OR have drafted the work or substantively revised it AND to have approved the submitted version (and any substantially modified version that involves the author's contribution to the study); AND to have agreed both to be personally accountable for the author's own contributions and to ensure that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any
part of the work, even ones in which the author was not personally involved, are appropriately
investigated, resolved, and the resolution documented in the literature. Acquisition of funding,
collection of data or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify
authorship. If these guidelines are not met, we would request the following change of authorship
form be filled out and sent to our editorial office -
https://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship

4. Please represent authors' names using their full initials, not their full name, in the Authors’
Contributions section. If there are any duplicated initials, please differentiate them to make it
clear that the initials refer to separate authors.

We thanks the editor’s reminder. We have corrected the content in the “Authors’ contributions”
section, on page 12, line 10 to line 12. Please see as follows:

WJ and MZ wrote the paper. NNW and MZ provided the cases. JW, GY and JG collected the
data. YYH and BYW did Statistical analysis. NNW revised and interpret the manuscript. CYX
designed and interpret the study.

5. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not
contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours.
All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional
files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and
additional/supplementary files are cited within the text.

We thanks the editor’s reminder and we will obey your rules.

Reviewer reports:

Claudio Gambardella, MD (Reviewer 1): Thanks for accepting my suggestion. In my opinion is
suitable for publication in its present form

We deeply appreciate to your positive decision.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 2): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several
testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?) Yes - there is
a clear objective. DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols)
appropriate for the objective? Yes - the approach is appropriate. EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results? Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately. STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate? Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study. INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated? Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable. OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound? Yes - current version is technically sound.

We deeply appreciate the positive comments from the peer reviewer.

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: No, the authors made all the suggested changes.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS: None

We deeply appreciate the positive comments from the peer reviewer.