

Reviewer 505679

The topic is very interesting and is currently under discussion. There are a number of issues that should be clarified by the authors to enhance this good work. It is necessary to define the methodology made during the review and the time covered, it can not be defined as a "systematically review" without knowing the methodology.

Methods section was added with the following text :

We performed a review of the literature from January 1980 to January 2015, including all English language articles using the search terms “endoscopic management”, “ureteroscopic management”, “percutaneous management” and “upper tract urothelial carcinoma”. A total of 236 articles were reviewed, yielding 66 articles pertinent to the topic. Outcome measures of upper tract recurrence, overall survival, and cancer specific survival were extracted from retrospective and prospective studies.

---

-In the section "nephron sparing treatments for UTUC" the second paragraph needs of references, because otherwise seems more a personal opinions.

The appropriate references have been added.

-The References are not properly made.

The references have now been reformatted according to specifications.

Reviewer 723046

I propose some considerations to take into account in order to be published: 1. It is a nice topic and it is controversial, good election. 2. It is not structured as the standard manuscripts: introduction-M&M-discussion-conclusion.

Format has been updated. As this is a mini-review, we did our best to accommodate the suggestion while maintaining a narrative flow.

3. Introduction: delete the last 3 lines, it is a pretentious opinion.

We respectfully disagree. These lines define the entire purpose for reviewing the literature and re-addressing this topic. The last line has been edited slightly to read as more neutral.

4. Page 5: "urologists...for UTUC?": The reason the natural aggressive behavior of UUT Carcinoma, one more time it is a pretentious opinion.

Edited for content and context.

5. Page 5: "a segmental ureterectomy...further here": why? then change the title of the review to endoscopic management and not "nephron sparing" because it is a part of it.

This line has been edited to highlight the nature of the review focuses on endoscopic management and its role in nephron preservation

6. Page 8: "as the systematic review...": This article is not a systematic review, it is not described the method, the protocol, the screening form, the data extraction and so on. IT is not structured like this so it is a "non systematic literature review"

This line has been edited to reflect the non-systematic review of this paper. Additionally, a methods section has been added .

7. The conclusion are in grade with EAU guidelines to perform non invasive treatment for UUT carcinoma, no news.

This is a statement, we are unsure how to incorporate this edit in the paper.

8. references: the letters don't have the same pattern. It seems to much references. Some of them have 1 author et al, some of them 2 authors et al. some of them 3 authors et al. you must fit it.

The references have been edited and standardized according to the provided guidelines.