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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.

Main text:

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

Materials and methods:

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

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

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.

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.

Which are the possible limitations of the study?

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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