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Author’s response to reviews:

BURO-D-16-00371R3Extraperitoneal laparoscopic resection for retroperitoneal lymphatic cyst: initial experienceYichun Wang; Chen Chen; Chuanjie Zhang; Chao Qin; Ninghong SongBMC UrologyDear Dr Qin,Your manuscript "Extraperitoneal laparoscopic resection for retroperitoneal lymphatic cyst: initial experience" (BURO-D-16-00371R3) has been assessed. Based on my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Urology, once you have carried out some essential revisions as indicated below.Once you have made the necessary corrections, please submit a revised manuscript online at:http://buro.edmgr.com/If you have forgotten your username or password please use the "Send Login Details" link to get your login information. For security reasons, your password will be reset.A point-by-point response letter must accompany your revised manuscript. This letter must provide a detailed response to each reviewer/editorial point raised, describing exactly what amendments have been made to the manuscript text and where these can be viewed (e.g. Methods section, line 12, page 5). If you disagree with any comments raised, please provide a detailed rebuttal to help explain and justify your decision. At this stage, we ask that you submit a clean version of your manuscript and do not include track changes or highlighting. Please also ensure that your revised manuscript conforms to the journal style, which can be found at the Instructions for Authors on the journal homepage. Please note, if your manuscript is accepted you will not be able to make any changes to the authors, or order of authors, of your manuscript once the editor has accepted your manuscript for publication. If you wish to make any changes to authorship before you resubmit your revisions, please reply to this email and ask for a 'Request for change in authorship' form which should be completed by all authors (including those to be removed) and returned to this email address. Please ensure that any changes in authorship fulfil the criteria for authorship as outlined in BioMed Central's editorial policies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorial-policies#authorship). Once you have completed and returned the form, your request will be considered and you will be advised whether the requested changes will be allowed. By resubmitting your manuscript you confirm that all author details on the revised version are correct,
that all authors have agreed to authorship and order of authorship for this manuscript and that all authors have the appropriate permissions and rights to the reported data. Please be aware that we may investigate, or ask your institute to investigate, any unauthorised attempts to change authorship or discrepancies in authorship between the submitted and revised versions of your manuscript. A decision will be made once we have received your revised manuscript, which we expect by 30 Oct 2017. We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions. Best wishes, Maggie Rahmati on behalf of Hayley Henderson

BMC Urology https://bmcurol.biomedcentral.com/

Editor comments:

Please make the following editorial revisions:

1) Ethics approval and consent to participate: The original declaration read: ‘The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Nanjing Medical University.’ In our last request for revisions we had asked you to also include the reference number for ethical approval given by the committee approving your study. However, instead you changed the statement to ‘Not applicable’. Please note that retrospective studies usually do require submission to an ethics committee for approval. Please therefore ensure that the study does have ethics committee approval and forward to us the relevant documentation that shows this. Without the proper ethical framework we will be unable to consider publishing the manuscript.

Response: Dear editor, we appreciate your advice on the ethics approval and submitted our ethics approval application. Some days earlier we got our approval. And the reference number is 2017-SRFA-012, beside we also attached the file as the additional file.

2) Consent for publication: In our last request for revisions we forwarded our template for consent for publication and you have confirmed that you have obtained appropriate consent for publication for each of the 8 cases presented. The wording of the declaration needs to reflect this and also from whom the consents were obtained. If appropriate, please amend the wording of the statement to the following: ‘Written informed consent for publication of their clinical details and/or clinical images was obtained from each patient. Copies of the consent forms are available for review by the Editor of this journal.’

Response: We have revised the wording of the declaration (Consent for publication).

3) Copyediting: The standard of English has improved since the manuscript was professionally edited. However, there remain several awkward or unusual terms/phrases and the meanings of some sentences appear to have been changed during the editing process. Please therefore consider the following amendments if you feel they are appropriate:

- ‘hydronephroses’ - we would suggest changing this term throughout the manuscript to ‘hydronephrosis’
- Methods, Clinical information, last sentence: ‘One year later’ to ‘Thereafter’
- Methods, Operation procedure: ‘posterior line axillary’ to ‘posterior axillary line’
- Methods, Operation procedure: ‘anterior line axillary’ to ‘anterior axillary line’
- Results: if the intended meaning is the same, we would suggest changing ‘The hydronephroses of all patients had degenerated…’ to ‘The hydronephrosis in all patients had resolved…’
- Discussion, first paragraph: if the intended meaning is the same, we would suggest changing ‘ventosity’ to ‘flatulence’
- Discussion, second paragraph: we think the meaning of the following sentence has been changed during the editing process: ‘Additionally, long-term obstruction of the ureter may lead to the degeneration of renal function, which should resolve over time.’ Please consider changing this sentence to the following if the intended meaning is correct: ‘Additionally, long-term obstruction of the ureter may lead to the deterioration of renal function, and should therefore be resolved in a