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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript aims to establish the incidence of upper urinary tract uroepithelial carcinoma by second diagnostic ureteroscopy as well as to determine possible risk factors. To the best of my knowledge there are no published papers on such kind of analysis. Data from long term patient follow-up of UTT negative patients at the time of the first ureterscopy are important for the clinical practice.

1. The proposed algorithm for patient enrollment and follow-up in the study and detailed description of the procedures are thoroughly described and convincing. Statistical analysis by Cox proportional hazard model, Kaplan-Meier methods and long-rank test using JMP version 11 is applied.

2. The data obtained are of interest: in 9.2% of the 65 patient that underwent second ureteroscopy 10 to 59 months after the first procedure UC of the UTT was discovered; the following statistically significant risk factors are defined – episode of gross hematuria, abnormal cytological findings during standard follow-up and male sex.

3. The authors cautiously interpret the data as they point out likely limitations of the study: retrospective design, small sample size, surgeon’s experience variations and uniform follow-up protocol. Nevertheless the results from the study and the discussion are interesting and the manuscript deserves to be published.

Discretionary Revisions

4. Table 1 should be revised so that the percentages correspond to those in the text. It would be beneficial to present the percentages up to the first decimal place. For example: abnormal cytological findings according to table 1 are present in 45%, but the manuscript states that they are 46%, while the actual number is 45.8% etc.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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