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Author’s response to reviews:

Responds to the technical comments:

Comment 1: Funding: include the role of funder
Response: We are so appreciated for this nice advice. The role of the funders was in the design and writing the study. And we have added it in our revised manuscript. (Revision position: Funding: Line 14, Page 16)

Responds to the editor’s comments:

Comment 1: Availability of data and materials: In the Availability of data and materials section please clearly state who should be contacted if someone wants to request the data.
Response: The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. We have added this statement in the revised manuscript. Thanks very much for the editor’s valuable advice. (Revision position: Availability of data and materials: Line 7, Page 16)

Comment 2: Please remove the “response to the comments of the editor and reviewers”, “cover letter” and “CARE checklist” files as they are no longer required at this stage.
Response: We have removed these files as suggested by the editor in our revised submission.

Comment 3: Overlap We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/17549485.12285. This overlap mainly exists in the Discussion and Conclusions section of your manuscript. While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. Please be informed that we cannot proceed with handling your manuscript before this issue is resolved, and the sections of text in question have been reformulated.
Response: We are very sorry for that situation. According to the editor’s important comment, we have re-written these sentences. And the sections of text in question have been reformulated in the revised manuscript. (Revision position: Discussion and Conclusions: Line 22, Page 8; Line 8, Page 9; Line 2, Page 10)

Comment 4: At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Additional files should remain uploaded as separate files. Please ensure that all figures, tables and additional.supplementary files are cited within the text.
Response: We are appreciated for these useful suggestions. We have uploaded the corresponding files in our revised submission according to these helpful suggestions.

Comment 5: BMC Urology operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.
Response: Thank you very much for your kindly suggestion. The reports and names of the reviewers have been viewed carefully via the action links of the online peer review system. We are so grateful for your and reviewers’ valuable work on our manuscript.

Once again, thank you very much for your constructive comments and suggestions.