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Author’s response to reviews:

Editorial Office,
BMC Urology
July 20, 2017

Dear Prof. Hayley Henderson,

Thank you for your letter and advice regarding the review and revision of our manuscript entitled “Robot-assisted laparoscopic reconstructed management of multiple aneurysms in renal artery primary bifurcations: a case report and literature review.” We have addressed all of the comments raised by the reviewers and have revised the paper accordingly. The amendments are highlighted in the revised manuscript. A point-to-point reply is included as follows. We appreciate all the reviewers, and thanks for their comments.
We would like to re-submit the revised manuscript for your consideration. We hope that the revision is acceptable, and we look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best Regards!

Yours sincerely,

Hai-bin Wei and Da-hong Zhang
Department of Urology
Zhejiang Provincial People's Hospital, School of Hangzhou Medical College
Email address: haibsjtu@outlook.com and zhangdahong88@yeah.net.

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the editor for their constructive and positive comments.

Editor Comments:

Thank you very much for your patience during the peer review process and we sincerely apologise for the delay in the processing of your manuscript. We would now be grateful if you could revise your manuscript according to the reviewer reports below. Please provide a point-by-point response and indicate exactly where changes to the text have been made. Please also provide a version of the manuscript with all revisions indicated, either through the track changes function or through text highlights.

1. Please re-upload the abstract into the submission system so that it exactly matches the abstract in the manuscript file.
Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated. We have re-uploaded the abstract into the submission system.

2. Please change the title of the conclusions to 'Discussion and conclusions'.
Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated.
We have changed the title of the conclusions.

3. Please ensure that you have the following sections in the Declarations section and that each title is as follows:

Declarations
- Ethics approval and consent to participate
- Consent to publish
- Availability of data and materials
- Competing interests
- Funding
- Authors' Contributions
- Acknowledgements

- Authors' Information.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated. We have changed the declarations section in the revised manuscript.

4. In the availability of data and materials section please include information on where data supporting the results reported in the article can be found. Please see our submission guidelines for examples of appropriate statements: https://bmcurol.biomedcentral.com/submission-guidelines/preparing-your-manuscript/case-report.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated.

Thank you for your advice. We have changed the availability of data and materials section in the revised manuscript.

5. In the authors' contributions section please refer to each author by their initials (e.g. FL for feng liu). Please ensure that every author is listed and meets our criteria for authorship. An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. According to the ICMJE guidelines, to qualify as an author one should have performed ALL FOUR of the following points.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated.

Thank you for your reminder. We have changed the contributions section in the revised manuscript.
6. In the Authors' contributions section please add a statement confirming that all the authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your reminding. We have added corresponding content in the revised manuscript.

7. Please include the tables in the main manuscript file rather than uploading them as separate files and place them at the end of the main text after the references.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is appreciated. We have made consequential changes in the revised manuscript.

8. Please provide the figure legends as a list after the references in the main manuscript file.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated. We have made consequential changes in the revised manuscript.

9. On re-submission please remove the CARE checklist as it will no longer be required.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is appreciated. We have made consequential changes in the revised manuscript.

10. Please complete a copy edit of the entire manuscript and correct any spelling and grammar errors that you find. Please indicate in the revised manuscript what changes to the text have been made.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated. We have made consequential changes in the revised manuscript.
We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their constructive and positive comments.

Reviewer #1 (Prof. Samay Jain):

Very well written. My only suggestion would be to spend a little more time in the discussion commenting on how others can replicate your techniques. Maybe a short paragraph on tips and tricks to the procedure that others can follow to avoid complications. Otherwise, there are a few grammatical errors. Very interesting work.

Response: Thank you very much for your comment.

For the tips and tricks, there are a couple of things. In the section of case presentation, we already have a specific description during the operation. The other part is about how to reduce WIT, which has been described in detail in discussion and conclusions section. In the revised manuscript, we have corrected the corresponding grammatical errors.

Reviewer #2 (Prof. Mohamad Hamady):

1. Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is appreciated. Thank you for your reminding.

2. This is an interesting case report of robotic assisted surgical repair of two renal artery aneurysms. It is a useful technique that provides alternative to open surgery. However, the authors should mention percutaneous interventional radiological approach which includes; stent
assisted coiling, covered stents, liquid embolization, balloon assisted liquid embolization. These techniques are well established minimally invasive techniques and cannot be ignored.

Response: The reviewer’s comment is well appreciated. As you mentioned, percutaneous interventional radiological approach plays a very important role in the treatment of renal artery aneurysms. Thank you very much for your advice. Therefore, we have added “RAAs can be managed in surgical or percutaneous interventional radiological ways. Because of lower invasiveness and reduced morbidity, percutaneous interventional radiological ways surpass traditional surgical techniques and have become increasingly popular.” in the revised manuscript.