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Reviewer's report:

This is an overall well written article on a small number of patients using a niche product stent. It is the scarcity of literature in this particular field which makes the article worthwhile publishing after some amendments.

Running head: too long

Introduction:
line 125 "intraluminal flow" : The Resonance does not have a lumen! Urine flows through the spiral grooves on the outside. This needs to be clarified.
Authors speak of limited case reports in the literature. this is correct. However, their series of 46 patient (of whom half died during the study) is also a case series at best. the merit is in the prospective nature of the study, but certainly not in the numbers! Please relativise related statements.

Methods:
line 154: radiological images cannot deteriorate!
line 160: should read 1 year OR until obstruction...

Results:
line 189: was should read is
line 202: almost 19% obstruction rate is still high. Statements as to efficacy have to be relativised throughout the paper!
line 203: Construction should read insertion
Only 2 stent exchanges are mentioned. in the reviewers own experience exchange can be extremely difficult due to tumor tissue ingrowth into the grooves of the stent (see above). It becomes then impossible to remove the stent. This should be discussed in the discussion. Was this the reason to opt for PCN in two patients?
line 222: This statement is interpretation and should go in the discussion. Also, 1 patient is hardly enough to draw any conclusion. This has been mentioned later in the limitations but must be made clear when the statement is used earlier in the script.

Discussion:
line 249: It is not right that all polyurethane stents needs changing 6-9 monthly. There are special PU Tumor stents that are designed to resist compression and remain indwelling for 1 year. this should be at least mentioned.
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