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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Robin L. Cassady-Cain,

Thank you very much for the critical re-review of our manuscript entitled “Outcome of buccal mucosa graft urethroplasty: a detailed analysis of success, morbidity and quality of life in a contemporary patient cohort at a referral center (BURO-D-17-00352R1)” and for offering us the opportunity to re-submit a revised version. We also would like to thank the reviewer for his helpful comment on our manuscript. According to the reviewer’s suggestion we have revised the manuscript. Below are our responses to the reviewer’s comment.

Respectfully yours,

Oliver Engel
(on-behalf of all co-authors)
Reviewer #1:

Comment 1: Thank you for addressing the comments from the reviewers. My only criticism is the following:

You have amended your manuscript to the following "In addition, the response rate is limited and to draw conclusions regarding the patients who did not answer the questionnaire is not possible, which might represent a possible source of bias. However, the response rate of the present study is still in an acceptable range when considering the follow-up period and the fact that a mailed questionnaire has been used." I disagree with this statement and will accept the revision if the following change is made: "In addition, the response rate is limited and to draw conclusion regarding the patients who did not answer the questionnaire is not possible, which might represent a source of bias."

We modified the manuscript as suggested by the reviewer as follows (discussion section, line 203-205):

“In addition, the response rate is limited and to draw conclusion regarding the patients who did not answer the questionnaire is not possible, which might represent a source of bias.”