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Author’s response to reviews:

We really appreciate your kind and detailed reviews. We have sincerely revised our manuscript according to your comments. We hope we could have adequately addressed your concerns in the revised manuscript.

Looking forward for your favorable response, we thank you in advance.

Reply to reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #2:

Abstract:

The aim of a scientific study would be to evaluate specific factors/ parameters of a process/ technique. The authors could consider providing a more accurate study aim.

The use stent symptom questionnaire could be described in the materials and methods as it represents an objective evaluation method.

-> According to your comment, we corrected some descriptions in the abstract.

Main text:
The authors should consider a careful English language revision. There are several syntax-expression errors throughout the text.

-> To correct the syntax-expression errors, the English in our revised manuscript has been checked by at least two professional editors, both native speakers of English. For a certificate, please see: http://www.textcheck.com/certificate/oQBd19

Materials and methods:

Was specific software used for the patient allocation? Please provide the appropriate information.

-> We used the random number generator (Excel 2010) for the patient allocation. We stated this in the methods.

Were the physicians responsible for the follow-up blinded for the group that the patients were assigned to?

-> The physicians could not know to which group the patients would be assigned before random allocation in operation room. But, on the follow-up the physicians were not blinded for the patient group because all the questionnaires were completed by self-reporting manner.

Results:

Interesting results could have been obtained if a subgroup analysis evaluating differences between the 2 sexes would have been performed. The authors are providing information for the subgroups only for the VAS pain evaluation.

-> According to your comment, we performed a subgroup analysis evaluating differences between the 2 sexes. We stated the subgroup analysis in the results section and added as the table 3.

Discussion:

The authors should clearly state that the results represent that comparison between the string removal and removal with flexible cystoscopy under local anesthesia. Discussion regarding similar studies should also consider carefully the techniques for stent removal that were considered for each study.

-> According to your comment, we added some related statements at the latter part of the discussion section.

Which are the possible limitations of the study?

-> We had stated two limitations regarding small sample size and short ureteral stent indwelling period within 7days at the last part of the discussion section.