

Post-operative sonological evaluation of pelvi-ureteric drainage of unilateral A-H pyeloplasty in childrenIslam et al. (russellrPMC@gmail.com)

Executive editor's comments (11-Oct-22)		Author's response (22-Feb-23)						
Thank you so much for sending the the manuscript. However, the following points need to be addressed as per journal checklist.		Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.						
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Please mention the type of the manuscript in the checklist. Add line number in the manuscript (go layout tab in the MS office and select the "continuous" line number). Follow the sequence of writing (serial 1- 12) as mentioned in the checklist. Change the title in sentence case (go "Case change" button under home tab of MS office and change into "Sentence case". Mention ORCID ID for at least first or corresponding authors (open and ORCID account in https://orcid.org/). Write highlights in bullet points. Mention the author contributions under following points: Conception and design Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data. Manuscript drafting and revising it critically. Approval of the final version of the manuscript, and. Guarantor accuracy and integrity of the work. In reference lists: Please write all author names for the cited articles (avoid et.al.). Use DOI for each cited article. Please share a populated EQUATOR checklist as mentioned. Copy to all authors 		<p>Thank you so much for the points raised for modification. We have incorporated all points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is "Brief Article" and mentioned in the checklist. Given the continuous line numbers. The sequence of writing followed as per guidelines. The title has given in "sentence case" format. Given the ORCID of first author. Given the Highlights in bullet points. An "Author contribution" section has given as per journal's guidelines. Provided DOI for all references. Given all author's name and removed et al. The EQUATOR checklist has attached with this email. All authors are copied. 						
Editor's Decision	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>a. Minor revision</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Major revision</td> <td style="text-align: center;">✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. Reject</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	a. Minor revision		b. Major revision	✓	c. Reject		
a. Minor revision								
b. Major revision	✓							
c. Reject								

Reviewer's comments		Author's response	
Date review assigned	28-Aug-22	Date sent to author	11-Oct-22
Date review returned	06-Oct-22	Date received from author	22-Feb-23
Reviewer name, affiliation, email, ORCID	Prof. Md. Razibul Alam Dept. of Gastroenterology, BSMMU razibulalam73@bsmmu.edu.bd		
Conflict of interest of the reviewer	No		

Please write Yes or No		Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is No. You must change the manuscript as per your response.
1. Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	No	Revised the study objective (Page 4; lines 109 to 112).
2. Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	No	Revised the Abstract (Page 2).
3. Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	No	We made changes, Page 4 (lines 115-121)
4. Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	No	Revised the methods and described elaborately under various headings.
5. Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	No	Given operational in the methods section.
6. Are the outcomes clearly defined?	No	Defined the outcome variables (110-112).
7. Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	No	Corrected the statistical analysis section (131-132)
8. Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	No	Revised the results section in line with the objective.
9. Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	No	Revised the tables and figure (Page 9).
10. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	No	Revised the discussion section.
11. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	No	The strengths and limitations of the study has been addressed (lines 172-174)
12. Are the conclusions justified by the results	No	Revised the conclusion (176,177)
13. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	No	All references were updated.
14. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	No	Improved the standard of writing.
15. Descriptive comments to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references.
Major points 1. Abstract should be rewritten with elaborated abbreviation. 2. Theoretical discussion with references in the introduction section for the justification of the study. 3. Clearly mention the objective & outcome of the study. 4. Methods should be rewritten.		Major points 1. Elaborated the Abstract 2. Added 3. Revised the objective of the study. 4. Elaborate the methods section.
Minor points 1. Grammers and quality of language should be improved. 2. More recent references. 3. Conclusion, limitations & recommendations should be in line with objectives		Minor points 1. Grammar of the manuscript. 2. References. 3. Conclusion, limitations and recommendations.
Reviewer's Recommendation (Tick mark on the open boxes to the right)	d. Minor revision	
	e. Major revision	✓
	f. Reject	

Second round

Executive Editor's comments (01-Mar-23)	Author's response (11-Mar-23)
<p>Thank you so much for sending the revised version of your manuscript. However, the following points still need to be addressed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please mention the type of the manuscript in the checklist. 2. Add line number in the manuscript (go layout tab in the MS office and select the "continuous" line number). 3. Follow the sequence of writing (serial 1- 12) as mentioned in the checklist. 4. Change the title in sentence case (go "Case change" button under home tab of MS office and change into "Sentence case" 5. Mention ORCID ID for at least first or corresponding authors (open and ORCID account in https://orcid.org/). 6. Write highlights in bullet points 7. Mention the author contributions under following points. Conception and design; Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data; Manuscript drafting and revising it critically; Approval of the final version of the manuscript, and; Guarantor accuracy and integrity of the work. 8. In reference lists: Please write all author names for the cited articles (avoid et.al.). Use DOI for each cited article. 9. Please share a populated EQUATOR checklist as mentioned. 	<p>Thank you for your feedback. I have carefully addressed the points you raised in the revision of my manuscript.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mentioned the type of the manuscript in the checklist. 2. Line numbers have been added to the manuscript. 3. The sequence of writing has been adjusted to follow the specified order (serial 1-12) as mentioned in the checklist. 4. The title has been changed to sentence case using the "Change Case" button under the home tab of MS Office. 5. ORCID IDs for the first/ corresponding authors have been provided 6. Highlights have been presented in bullet points. 7. Author contributions have been clearly outlined as per journal's instruction. 8. In the reference lists, all author names for the cited articles have been included, and "et al." has been avoided. DOIs have been added for each cited article. 9. Shared the populated EQUATOR checklist as requested.