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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Professor Dr. Henderson,

as suggested, we have again revised 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-17-00352R2)”. Below are our responses to the reviewer’s comments. All changes in the manuscript were highlighted in bold letters.

Respectfully yours,

Oliver Engel

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

Comment 1:

Methods

In the methods section, can you please ensure the following information is presented.

- What was the inclusion/exclusion criteria

Done, we included the following statement: “Inclusion criteria were patients with urethral stricture disease, who were treated with BMGU at our institution. Patients' refusal to participate in the study was an exclusion criteria.”

- When did the patients receive the questionnaire, e.g. home, clinic, workplace

Done, we included the following statement: “On July 25th 2013, the questionnaire was sent to 187 patients in paper form by post. Patients received the questionnaire at home.”

- How was the questionnaire presented to the participants, e.g. paper, email, post, face-to-face interview?

Done, see above, we included the following statement: “On July 25th 2013, the questionnaire was sent to 187 patients in paper form by post.”

- How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?

As stated in the result section of the manuscript, 83 patients (44.4%) completed the questionnaire and were included in analyses. Thus, 104 patients did not complete the questionnaire and dropped out. We do not know the specific reasons, which contributed to patients' refusal to participate or to not fill out the questionnaire. In the discussion section of the manuscript, we pointed out that the limited response rate represents a strong limitation of the present study.

To address the reviewer's concern, we included the following sentence in the discussion section of the manuscript:

“The specific reasons for the limited response rate remain unknown.”
Comment 2:

Declarations

- In the Declarations section, can you please state the full name of the ethical committee that approved the study protocol, listing the acquired reference number.

As stated in the methods section of the manuscript, there was a Institutional Review Board approval. This is the corresponding reference number: PV4123. We modified the manuscript as stated below.

- In the same section, can you please also confirm whether written or verbal consent was obtained from each participant.

Done, we included the following statement: “Data on 187 patients with urethral stricture disease, who were treated with BMGU at the University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf between 12/05/2008 and 07/21/2010, were prospectively collected in the local urethroplasty database and retrospectively reviewed following Institutional Review Board approval (local ethics committee approval number PV4123). Patients were included following written consent from each patient.”

Comment 3:

Other minor revision points:

1. Ethics approval and consent to participate

- Please include the full name of the ethics committee that approved the study and the committee’s reference number if appropriate. Please also specify whether consent to participate was given verbally or in written format. If verbal consent was used please provide a reason why verbal consent to participate was used rather than written consent.

Done, see above.

2. Consent for publication

- This section refers to patient consent to publish identifiable data. As your manuscript does not contain any individuals’ data, please revise the statement under consent to publish to simply state “Not Applicable”.

Done.
3. Authors’ contributions

- Please also ensure that all authors have read and approve of the final version and add a statement confirming this.

Done.

4. Section headings

- Please add a section heading ‘Declarations’ to before the References.

Done.

5. Textual overlap

- We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:


  And


  This overlap mainly exists in the Statistical analysis section.

We understand this is included in the Methods section, please be aware that we cannot condone the direct use of text from previously published work. Please re-phrase these sections to minimise overlap.

Done, we rephrased the methods section of the manuscript.