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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editors,

The names of the authors were reversed in the following order: Given names and surnames, instead of surnames and first names. The limits of the study were added in the first paragraph of the discussion. English language corections were made by a researcher from the department of English at the University of Zinder(Niger)

Authors’s response to reviews

Title: Surgical management of pyelo-ureteral junction syndrome in a resource-limited setting: Case of Zinder National Hospital, Niger

Authors:
Harissou Adamou : e-mail : harissou1976@yahoo.fr
Maazou halidou: e-mail: halidou3@yahoo.fr
Hassane Diongolé: e-mail : diongolen@yahoo.fr
Responses to Reviewers
Dear Reviewers, Thanks for the corrections made for the improvement of our manuscript. All corrections are incorporated in this revised version. Changes are highlighted in yellow.

Reply to Maria Francesca Monn (Reviewer 1):
1. General:
The authors are to be commended for gathering and presenting this comprehensive overview of PUJS at their hospital in Niger. Overall, the study presented is helpful in our understanding of the global burden of disease of PUJS. Throughout there are grammatical/typographical errors that need to be addressed prior to publication

Response: Thank you for your positive remarks. Typographical and grammatical corrections were made to the manuscript

2. Abstract: The abstracts do not match (one must have been pasted in separately from the manuscript itself)

Response: The abstracts have been standardized.

3. Background: nothing

4. Methods:
Please describe the catchment area of Zinder National Hospital to help the reader gain an idea of the representation of the population that this study provides.
In the third paragraph, I believe the word "descending" is not the intended word.
Is renal lodge the same as renal pelvis?
Please change the final sentence to instead read, "The surgery was considered successful when there…"
Please include a statement regarding consent/ethical approval.

Responses:
- Changes were made to the methodology to talk about the study framework and to describe the catchment area of Zinder National Hospital. Page 3, lines 44-47
- The word “descending” is replaced by “uncrossing”. Page 4, line 13
- The renal lodge is the renal compartment, not the renal pelvis. Page 4, line 14
- The beginning of the final sentence is changed. Page 4, line 31
- The statement regarding consent/ethical approval was included. Page 4, line 34

5. Results/Tables:
Please include post-operative renal function at 6 months for the patients in the table and the text.
For the 2 patients with continued lower back pain, was this thought to represent a failed pyeloplasty?
Was there any imaging or investigation performed to further evaluate?
How did you determine when to remove the drains (this can be included in the methods or results)?
Did the case of late urinary leakage occur after removal of the drains and how was it managed?
Did both cases of SSI resolve with oral antibiotics or were the patients admitted to the hospital for IV
antibiotics?

Responses:

- Post-operative renal function at 6 months for the patients is included in the text; Page 5, line 27-29. The table was changed and a column was inserted for creatinine levels at 6 months of follow-up (Table I)
- For the 2 patients with continued lower back pain, the pyeloplasty was successful, which was confirmed by the intravenous urography. It was residual pain related to lumbar incision. Page 5, line 25-26
- The drains was removed after 48 hours, if they did not bring back any fluid. Page 4, line 14-15
- For the only case of anastomotic fistula, the retro-peritoneal drain was kept in place for 25 days (Table I)
- Cases of surgical site infection resolve with oral antibiotics only.

Reply to Cristian Fiori (Reviewer 2)

We thank you for your interest in this manuscript. We are aware of the technical shortcomings of our environment, but we would like to share with the rest of the world, our daily management of the PUJS in a hospital with limited resources. The limits of the study were added in the first paragraph of the discussion. Page 9, line 35-40