

ROUND1

First of all, we would like to thank the esteemed editors and advisor referees, who contributed to making our article more valuable with their valuable and constructive criticisms and gave them the chance to revise. The modified parts are highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer-1

The case is interesting and novel with expected benefits to the readers. However, there are many concerns that should be addressed. It would be more interesting to provide: 1) More specific data about the case in the abstract. The main bulk of the abstract should be specific to the case and its findings and management.

R1: The abstract has been revised with details about the patient.

2) The complaint of the patient and its duration at the first sentence of the Case presentation section. Use the CARE criteria.

R2: In the first sentence of the case presentation section, the patient's complaints were stated.

3) The physical examination findings of this old patient: general and local.

R3: The physical examination findings of this patient was stated.

4) Laboratory workups such as urine analysis, hemoglobin level, blood sugar, bleeding profile, etc.

R4: Laboratory findings was stated.

5) Reduction of the use of the terms such as (our) and (we), (thier) and use the passive form instead, such as (In this study, it was found ; A study byet al. showed

R5: Necessary corrections have been made.

6) Correct scientific terms to replace terms as (endoscopic cystolithotomy; to be endoscopic cystolithotripsy) and (controls of the patient). These terms are not correctly used.

R6: Necessary corrections have been made.

7) Remove the the first sentence of the conclusion because it is not relevant to the current case. Reformulate the conclusion and provide only the findings from the current case, but not general conclusions.

R7: The conclusion section has been revised

8) Revision for language polishing.

R8: Language was revised.

Reviewer -2

Interesting case report, informative with good discription and photographs.

R1: We would like to thank reviewer.

ROUND2

The authors responded to comments with correction of some points. However and unfortunately, they failed to respond satisfactorily to other comments, especially to providing the physical examination and laboratory findings of this old patient. Even they were within normal, examination and laboratory findings are essential workups that should be mentioned clearly but not as a negating statement only. At least, the digital rectal examination (DRE) and urine analysis findings would be mentioned. As they were normal, what are your explanations for these negative findings in the context of the symptoms, presence of an obstructing stone in the bladder neck by computed tomography, and previous TURP? (Provide these explanations in the Discussion section)

In addition, still there are multiple incorrect terms need revision; The term prothatic (should be prostatic); pneumatics (should be pneumatic lithotripter); prostate (TUR) or TUR prostatectomy; should be TURP), etc.

R1: Dear reviewer, he is quite right in his comments. It should have been mentioned even if the patient's laboratory and physical examination findings were normal. As a matter of fact, we added laboratory and physical examination findings to the relevant sections. Additionally, word and letter errors have been corrected.