

Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-22-318>

Review Comments (Round 1)

Reviewer A

Comments: Completed Article, it will be a great article to this journal

Reply: Thank you very much for reviewing my manuscript in your busy schedule, and I'm very grateful for your comments. We hope you can be healthy and happy every day

Changes in the text: None.

Reviewer B

Comments: The authors present a comprehensive review of Greenlight Laser Photovaporization educational videos on the Youtube platform. A standardized checklist of video attributes has been adopted from the laparoscopic literature. The idea is original and the data collection, assembly, and analysis is well organized and presented. My recommendation for major revision is related more to grammar, sentence structure, and readability. Extensive editing is required to remove unnecessary words, redundant sentences, and reduce the word count. It is a simple study and could be presented with far fewer words. I began to edit the initial sections and included my corrections but a complete rewrite is beyond the scope of my reviewer responsibilities.

Reply: Thank you very much for your valuable advice. We are deeply sorry for the bad experience caused by our writing problems to your reading. According to the comments you gave us, we found a third party service to polish the language, adjusted the grammar, structure and readability of the article accordingly, and made changes in the review mode. At the same time, we also simplified the expression of the text, hoping to occupy your precious time to review again.

Changes in the text: According to your instructions, we have made corresponding adjustments to the grammar, sentence structure, readability, and simplification of the article, and displayed it in red and blue font in the review mode. However, due to the large amount of modified space, in order to avoid causing trouble to your reading, the specific changes in the article beg you to review it in the manuscript. We believe that the manuscript has been much improved a lot based on your valuable suggestions. Thus, we highly appreciated your constructive criticisms.

Review Comments (Round 2)

Comments: Thank you for the revisions. The readability is improved significantly. I commend you for writing an article that is not in your first language. I would not be able to accomplish that.

Line 136-8 remove list of LUTS. This is superfluous and audience of urologists is very familiar with the components of the IPSS.

Line 146 - change to “there are many side effects such as hypotension and lethargy.”

Line 152 - change the sentence starting with "Teaching the technology" to Barriers to teaching greenlight laser PVP include lack of access to teaching hospitals for community surgeons and lack of repetition that is afforded by video viewing.

Line 237 - developed instead of developed.

Line 239 - vaporization(s).

Line 390 - instead of "providing a consult" change to providing a template.

Line 400 - instead of “advice of two professional doctors” change to advice of the authors.

Line 403 – “wavelength of greenlight laser is 532-556, hemoglobin is easier absorb” change to wavelength of greenlight laser is 532-556, the absorption coefficient for hemoglobin is very high minimizing bleeding.

Reply: Thank you for your advice, we have adjusted our manuscript referring to your valuable advice.