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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Prof. Sanjay Sinha:

We sincerely appreciate your comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Robot-assisted laparoendoscopic single-site surgery for the simultaneous management of multiple urinary tract calculi: a case report and experience sharing” (Manuscript Number: BURO-D-19-00554R1). These comments are indeed valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript, as well as guiding our authors to have a more rigorous attitude towards the present research. We have studied these comments carefully and have edited the accompanying video. The revised manuscript and accompanying video have also been checked to comply with the format requirement explained on the BMC Urology website. All authors have reviewed and approved the revisions.
We appreciate for your warm work earnestly. Thank you very much! We hope to receive your reply soon.

Warmest wishes for a merry Christmas!

Yours sincerely,

Qiming Liu

Department of Urology, Hainan Hospital of Chinese PLA General Hospital, Sanya, China
Email: lqm1199@163.com

The detailed point-by-point responses are as follows:

1. **Add a title, author name(s), institution**

   Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have added the title, author names, institution at the “0 min 1 sec” of the video.

2. **Single slide showing salient features of presentation (text)**

   Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have added salient features of presentation at the “0 min 5 sec” of the video.

3. **Please add CT image**

   Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have added CT images at the “0 min 10 sec” of the video.

4. **Suggest use of the word 'Dissection' rather than 'Dissociation' for sections 1 and 2**

   Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have revised the video by adding the word “Dissection” at the “0 min 20 sec and 0 min 35 sec” of the video.

5. **The length of some of the sections needs to be increased to allow for the viewer to discern what's being done. The current video length of sections 1 and 2 is about 4s each. That's too short for a video to register!**

   Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have increased the length of sections 1 and 2.

6. **The section on ureterolithotomy appears somewhat disjointed (without adequate continuity of thought). Please reassess the original video and take appropriate segments**
Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have reedited the video of the “ureterolithotomy” section.

7. A slide giving follow up information (text) with a postop image

Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have added the follow up informations and images at the “2 min 45 sec and 2 min 50 sec” of the video.

The video should be able to stand ‘on its own’. This might necessitate lengthening it a bit. That should be okay since the current length is about 72s. The still images could be about 4s each. That’s usually enough for stills to register. It should be possible to manage all this in a length of about 2min or so

Response to Editor: Thank you so much for your valuable comments. We have revised the video by increasing the length of all still images to 5s. The total length of the video is increased to 3 mins.