

To editor

Dear Peer-reviewers and Editorial Office,

Thank you very much for your interest and editing on our manuscript. Thanks for your suggestions to our previous submission of manuscript (**Manuscript NO: 76130: Laparoscopic Treatment of Bilateral Duplex Renal and Ectopic Ureter**). Now, we will address your comments.

The substantive changes in our manuscript:

- ①. We have streamlined the introduction.
- ②. We have shortened the case presentation and deleted the subparagraphs.
- ③. We have deleted all commercial names of companies previously enclosed in the paper.
- ④. We tried our best to update some of the old references and insert some new ones. (see blue wording in references).
- ⑤. We have deleted the international databases.
- ⑥. We have rewritten the sections of the manuscript as requested by the journal.
- ⑦. We added the operative time (see blue wording in case presentation)
- ⑧. We added the comparison to the unilateral cases mentioned (see blue wording in discussion and conclusions)
- ⑨. We added the scale bar in the pathological pictures (See figure 4)
- ⑩. We have asked MedSci Healthcare Inc. to professionally polish the manuscript. (see the certificate in the attachment)

We would like to re-submit this revised manuscript to *World Journal of Clinical Cases*, and hope it can be published in your journal.

We look forward to hearing from you soon!

With kindest regards,

Li Wan

To reviewer 1

Dear reviewer 1,

Thank you very much for your interest and comments on our manuscript. Now, we will address your comments one by one, and we have added more details into our manuscript according your suggestions.

1) Introduction too long;

Our response: Thank you for this suggestion. We have shorted the introduction section from 403 to 178 words.

2) The case presentation must be shorter and must not be divided into subparagraphs;

Our response: Thanks for your comment. We have reduced the case presentation from 1196 to 768 words and removed subparagraphs.

3) authors should not include commercial names of companies;

Our response: As requested by the reviewer, we have deleted all commercial company names previously mentioned in the paper.

4) Figures of good quality and acceptable references even if not very recent;

Our response: We appreciate your suggestions. We tried our best to update some of the old references. We have changed the old reference by **Wang S.** (2013; 28: 151-152) to the new article by **Gulleroglu NB.** (2020, 7(4):6), the old reference by **Goyanna R.** (1945;54:1-9) to the new article by **Gang-Feng HU.** (2014,12(09):20-22), the old reference by

Kazemi-Rashed F. (2005,2:20-22) to the new article by **Rrm M.** (2019,6(1):5), the old reference by **Zou Z.** (2010:89-90) to the new article by **Zhang GF.** (2018,3(17):87-88+105), the old reference by **Abedinzadeh M.** (2012,10:Doc05) to the new article by **Zhang Y.** (2017), the old reference by **Shiao CC.** (2011,16:453) to the new article by **Solinas A.** (2020,92(4)), the old reference by **Li HZ.** (2011,77:1122-1125) to the new article by **Wenwei LV.** (2016,8(04):93-95).

5) Since this is not a systematic review, the authors should not cite research through international databases otherwise they should enter inclusion and exclusion criteria that go beyond a case report;

Our response: Thanks for the valuable suggestions. We have rewritten the relevant sections of the manuscript as requested by your journal.

6) Overall the setting of the sections of the manuscript must be revised on the basis of the indications of the journal

Our response: We have rewritten the manuscript sections that need to be revised on the basis of the indications of the journal.

To reviewer 2

Dear reviewer 2,

Thank you very much for your interest and comments on our manuscript. Now, we will address your comments one by one, and we have added more details into our manuscript according your suggestions.

1. You should give informations about the operative time.

Our response: We have added the operative time lasting 167 minutes in the revised manuscript.

2. You should give in comparison to the unilateral cases mentioned in literature, operative obstacles and if there is or there is no complications from this type of management.

Our response: Thanks for your indications and suggestions. We have added the comparison to the unilateral cases mentioned. In this case, the operation time (167 min) was not different from previously reported unilateral operation time (137 ± 38 min), and the child patient could benefit from only one anesthesia. However, the same bilateral operation was more demanding for the operator, because there was no need to change the body position and increase the operation channel. There were no complications such as hypertension, urinary tract infection with fever, urinary cyst and loss of lower renal function following the surgery.

To Science editor

Dear Science editor,

Thank you very much for your interest and comments on our manuscript. Now, we will address your comments one by one, and we have added more details into our manuscript according your suggestions.

1. The writing structure needs to be further organized and the writing language needs to be further refined.

Our response: Thanks for your suggestions. We have asked MedSci Healthcare Inc., who often cooperates with our hospital work to professionally polish the full text of our manuscript.

2. The pathological pictures in the manuscript need to be marked with a scale bar.

Our response: As suggested, we have marked the pathological pictures with a scale bar (X200, HE staining smear).

3. The number of total references is few and a bit outdated, maybe a few more related references could also be cited.

Our response: Again, thanks for your suggestions on citing the references. We tried our best to update some of the old references. We have changed the old reference by **Wang S.** (2013; 28: 151-152) to the new article by **Gulleroglu NB.** (2020, 7(4):6), the old reference by **Goyanna R.** (1945;54:1-9) to the new article by **Gang-Feng HU.** (2014,12(09):20-22), the old reference by **Kazemi-Rashed F.** (2005,2:20-22) to the new article by **Rrm M.** 2019,6(1):5), the old reference by **Zou Z.** (2010:89-90) to the new article by **Zhang GF.** 2018,3(17):87-88+105), the old reference by **Abedinzadeh M.** (2012,10:Doc05) to the new article by **Zhang Y.** 2017), the old reference by **Shiao CC.** (2011,16:453) to the new article by **Solinas A.** 2020,92(4)), and the old reference by **Li HZ.** (2011,77:1122-1125) to the new article by **Wenwei LV.** 2016,8(04):93-95). In addition, we have inserted the following updated references: 2. Chen SX.2014,30(03):397-399; 3. Pan HF.2021,33(10):1326-1328; 14. Ye WX.2022, 10(4):7; 15. Ohzeki T.2012, 58(8):453-456; 23. Wen YA.2018.,10(02):41-43+29; and 16.Greenfield ZP.2021,63(3).

With kindest regards,

Li Wan