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Author’s response to reviews:

To the To the Editor-in-Chief of
BMC Nephrology

Rome - March 14, 2019

Dear Editor,

thank you for considering our manuscript "Relapsed Papillary Urothelial Neoplasm of Low Malignant Potential (PUNLMP)” potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Urology.

As requested we have made the necessary corrections in the manuscript. Furthermore, below we provide a detailed response to each reviewer.

Reviewer 1:

1. Authors mentioned incidence of 0.1% - 0.4% and less than 35 cases described in children below ten years of age. However, the reference cited is very old and in the year of reference there is typing mistake. Reference 4 is a 15 years old study. Please add new reference because the below two articles describe about 35 cases together in paediatric population. (Berrettini A, Castagnetti M, Salerno A, Nappo SG, Manzoni G, Rigamonti

2. Histopathology pictures are lacking, and on endoscopy the tumor looks like papillary urothelial carcinoma. Please add low and high power pics.

We are sorry but we do not have available histopathology pictures.

3. English language needs improvement at several places. For example page 3 line 80.81 has no meaning- Two months later, chemical and cytological urinary tests and cystoscopy were achieved, with random biopsies of the primarily affected areas, which resulted regular.

We have made the required corrections to English language.

Reviewer 2:

1. Authors reported a case of papillary urothelial neoplasm of low malignant potential in a child. The article is interesting but not very well structured, in particular in "Case presentation" section. I suggest a revision of the structure of this paragraph. Was an preoperative ultrasound performed? Was a urine cytology done during follow-up? Was a TUR performed during the cystoscopy performed at one year (it is not reported)?

We specified that in addition to cystoscopy, ultrasonography was also performed among the preoperative diagnostic tests. We had already reported that the urinary cytology examination was performed between follow-up examinations. Finally, we added that a TUR was performed during the cystoscopy at one year.

Best regards,

Silvia Triarico, MD - Corresponding Author