

The authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript based on peer-review report(s) and make a point-to-point response to the issues raised in the peer-review report(s) which listed below:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In this simple and nice manuscript, a retrospective case-series study, the authors report their experience regarding the use of a nephroureterostomy tube (NUT) in case of ureteral obstruction on a cumulative study cohort of 34 pts (37 procedures). Particularly, the authors evaluated the capping trial success of NUT, defined as the lack of symptoms of failure-the lack of ipsilateral flank pain and the complete aspiration via NUT of retained contrast in bladder, as a positive predicting factor for the conversion to ureteral stent. The manuscript is very simple and well written, the introduction is exhaustive, the tables are complete, the discussion is with a good readability. In my opinion few corrections are needed before accepting on WJCU. 1. Please insert the page number and the lines. Page and line numbers are added. Please remove the phrase "the study cohort information is shown in table 1" from results section. The phrase is removed from results section. Table 1 is cited in the text in Materials and Methods section. 2. Why did the authors consider as successful capping trial the complete aspiration of the retained contrast in bladder via NUT? Is it not the same thing to insert contrast and see its descent in the bladder? Because some patients may become uroseptic with forceful injection of contrast antegradely into the renal pelvis, it is our standard practice to avoid forceful injection into NUT and to not pursue contrast flow into the bladder. The study was designed to only capture patients in who procedural images were conclusive of aspiration of contrast from the bladder through NUT. This is clarified in materials and methods section. 3. This procedure is a two-step procedure: before the positioning the NUT and in case of successful capping, in a second time, the positioning of the double J stent. However, at today, we have available in commerce a type of NUT that eliminates a catheter to stent exchange procedure and, consequently, the need to carry out a second x-ray procedure. It is our standard practice to convert NUT to ureteral stent (internalization) only if capping trial is successful. This it to avoid urosepsis and other complications if a particular patient is not ready for internalization. Using the mentioned convertible catheter may save resources for patients who will pass capping trial. But it will be wasteful for those who do not pass capping trail. Given the additional cost of the convertible catheter, our group has opted not to use them currently. 4. Why did the authors not use the same procedure in case of ureteral obstruction due to ureteral stone? Ureteral stone is another indication for this intervention however given our institution's nature of comprehensive cancer center, ureteral stones are rare in our patient population.

Step 6: Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the nephroureterostomy tube based on aspiration of contrast from bladder. The topic is within the scope of the WJCU. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript is very simple and well written, the introduction is exhaustive, the tables are complete, the discussion is with a good readability. However, there are some issues should be addressed. The authors need to add more details in the "method" section. More details are added to methods section. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; Reviewers questions are answered. and (3) Format: There is 1 table and 3 figures. A total of 4 references are cited, including 1 reference published in the last 3 years. The authors need to add more literatures. More literature is added. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. The manuscript is from the United States. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, and the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form. The authors need to provide the Copyright License Agreement signed by all authors, all authors have personally agreed in personal conversations with the contributing author to their electronic signatures submitted on the form uploaded into B6Publishing site, and original Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Original IRB approval form is submitted. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. The authors have published the "abstract" section ([https://www.jvir.org/article/S1051-0443\(18\)30619-5/fulltext](https://www.jvir.org/article/S1051-0443(18)30619-5/fulltext)). 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by National Institute of Health. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCU. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised: (1) I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions; Author contributions is added to manuscript. (2) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); NIH/NCI Cancer Center Support Grant P30 CA008748 is an institutional grant. All investigators are obligated to mention this institutional grant in their academic works. The grant does not apply to any individual investigator. (3) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; Original figures are provided in PowerPoint format. (4) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; References are updated as requested. (5) I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main

text; Article highlights is added to manuscript. and (6) I have changed the manuscript type "clinical and translational research" to "retrospective study". 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.