

Congratulations, it is a very complete review. I would add the possibility of hematuria ex-vacuo (following rapid bladder decompression) and its management. **Thank you, this has been added into the surgical issues section.**

In case of the acute urinary retention, due to BPH or urethral stricture, the first thing is bladder catheterisation through urethra or placing a suprapubic catheter. Surgical or pharmacological management of any of the underlying causes of the obstruction could be discussed afterwards. **We have elected to retain the current manuscript structure, with pharmacologic management grouped in a single section. This discusses pharmacological management of urologic diagnoses including BPH and stones. Surgical management options are beyond the scope of this article.**

The article is within the scope of the journal, and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and easy to read. However, some improvements are needed: * A discussion section should be included where the review carried out is summarized and synthesized, organizing the different lines of work that are reflected in the reviewed articles. **Thank you, we have now added a penultimate section entitled 'Discussion and Takeaway Points' which addresses these suggestions.**

* The introduction should be expanded and better contextualize the scope in which the review is carried out. **We have added a section in the introduction explaining that the context of this article is that there is poorer understanding of medical management of obstructive uropathy compared with other medical kidney diseases and with urologic surgery.**

*It must be explained how the review was carried out, what type of review was carried out, sources consulted, selection criteria. **Thank you. We have added a methods paragraph.**

Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Yes Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? No 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized

Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes **Thank you for your feedback. This reviewer has not requested that any further alterations be made to the manuscript.**