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Reviewer’s report:

The paper is very interesting, but some comments are necessary:

The ureteral reconstruction with bowel segments (Monti and mitrofanoff techniques) are very usual in urologic practice. In introduction the authors do not abord this techniques. Is important to do that. In discussion the authors needs to discuss and abord the "numerous postoperative complications" of bowel reconstructive surgeries.

The experimental study is interesting, but in authors opinion the dog is a good experimental model for future conclusions about ureteral reconstruction in humans? The anatomy and the histology of the dog bladder and ureter are similar with humans? What is the diameter of the ureter in the dogs? What is the bladder capacity? This informations need to be informed in material and methods section.

The dogs had about 1 year old. Why the authors do not studied animals with another ages?

The study with only 9 cases is enough in authors opinion?

6 to 8 weeks is enough to maintain the stents?

How the authors can explain the mild hydronephrosis observed after the procedure? There are some kind of obstruction in the place of the graft?

In this study the graft was put only in mild ureter? Why the authors do not put the graft in proximal ureter?

The discussion section needs to be improved.

If the authors compared the bladder graft group wiht a group with intestinal segment (Monti/Mitrofanoff) reconstruction the paper will be much more strong. Is possible to do that?

In figures 3 and 4 - The authors used HE? Gomori? Masson? This information missed in legends

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.

No

**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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