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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor:

Thank you very much for your email dated on 15-Mar-2020 regarding our manuscript (BURO-D-19-00597R1) entitled "Endoscopic combined intrarenal surgery in the prone-split leg position for successful single session removal of an encrusted ureteral stent: a case report". We thank you to consider our manuscript for publication if we carry out some essential revisions. The response of point by point to the critiques is attached. Herein, we re-submit our revised manuscript to the Journal of BMC Urology.

We hope the current revised manuscript will be acceptable for publication in your honorable journal.

Yours sincerely,

Demao Ding, MD
For Dr. Daniele Castellani Comments:

1) The supplementary video should be cited in the main text after surgical description

Response: Thank you for your attention. We are sorry to ignore to cite the supplementary video in the main text. Now, the cite message can be viewed in case presentation, line 20, page 4.

2) The paper would benefit English editing, because there are several grammar errors (especially in verb tenses) which impair fluent reading.

Response: Thank you for your remind. There are still some mistakes. We checked our manuscript and modified the grammer again.

For Dr. Cecilia Maria Cracco Comments:

1) Major English editing is still required.

Response: Thank you for the comments. We are very sorry for our incorrect writing. There are still some mistakes. We checked our manuscript and modified the grammer again.

2) - Abstract, Case presentation: with left ureteral stent placed 2 years before developed both pyelic and vesical stones on the two ends of the double J...
Response: Thank you for your advice. We have added it in abstract, case presentation.

3) Materials and Methods: please explain why you chose ballistic for the bladder encrustation and US for the pyelic one (and not combined, or laser, for instance)

Response: Dear professor, thank you for your question. The bladder encrustation is hard and large. The effect of pneumatic ballistic lithotripsy is obvious. In addition, vibration can make the stone around the tube fall off and avoid ureteral stent damage. If ultrasonic lithotripsy is used, the lithotripsy efficiency is poor because of the hard stone.

The CT value of calculus in renal pelvis is low, so the texture is soft. The effect of ultrasonic lithotripsy combined with negative pressure suction is obvious, so as to avoid infection caused by high pressure in the renal pelvis.

Pneumatic ballistic lithotripsy and ultrasonic lithotripsy had no obvious damage to ureteral stent. If laser lithotripsy is used, ureteral stent may be damaged and fragments of stent may be lost.

4) 22F Amplatz sheath: and which nephroscope?

Response: In the case, the surgeon 1 use a nephroscope (8964.401, R.WOLF, Germany) to across the 22F amplatz sheath.