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Author’s response to reviews:

The point-to-point response to the Editor and Reviewers are listed below.

Editor Comments:

1. Please address the remaining reviewer comments. These can be found below.

We made point-to-point response to the comments by the reviewers.

2. In the “Funding” section of your declarations, please clarify the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

We added following words to the manuscript.

‘specifically in financial support of language editing and manuscript publication.’
3. Please consider the list of authors as it currently stands with reference to our guidelines regarding qualification for authorship (http://www.biomedcentral.com/submissions/editorial-policies#authorship).

We added following words to the manuscript.

‘M.N. and S.Y. have made major contribution in conception of the study, interpretation of data, and revision of the initial draft manuscript.’

4. Please include a statement in the Authors’ contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

We added following words to the manuscript.

‘All authors have read and approved the manuscript.’

Reviewer reports:

Ali M. Ziada (Reviewer 1): While the study has its limitations resulting from lack of answers to some questions, I think these limitations would be applicable to any similar study due to the long duration between surgery and its impact in the future. It is interesting and important to look at long term consequences of what we do for children as they get older.

We greatly appreciate the comment of the reviewer.

Kimihiro Moriya (Reviewer 2): The revised manuscript was well written except one minor point.

"81.2% (358/43)" (the bottom line in P16) should be 81.7% (358/438) based on the original version.

We greatly appreciate the attention the reviewer has paid upon detail of the manuscript, overlooked by us.
Bruce Schlomer (Reviewer 3): The authors have updated the manuscript significantly and responded to all suggestions. There are a few issues that cannot be overcome and will be up to the editors if they choose to publish or not.

We appreciate the sincere professionalism of the reviewer and expect that shortcomings of the manuscript should be overcome in future studies.

1. Small number of patients from a surgical approach that is not used anymore

Indeed, follow up agenda should be clearly stated to the patients’ parents to recruit back sufficient number of patients in the coming studies.

We should also point out that, there is no guarantee that current procedures will be performed 25 years later. For example, few pediatric urologists perform MAGPI and TPIF, which used to be fashionable 20 year ago. Two-stage repair, which has been abandoned by Dr Duckett, has revived as preferred choice for cases with bending, in many institutes. We should learn from the past, to do something in the future.

2. Unknown desire for paternity

We do regret for not including the point in the questionnaire, and will surely do it if we have any chance to repeat it. We presented paternity in the article as a collective result of desire for having offspring and physical ability to attain it, and avoided the word ‘infertility’ to ensure scientific consistency.

3. These 90 patients were included in a publication already w