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We present here point-to-point responses for each of the comments in the attached document and have revised our manuscript accordingly. And we hope the revised manuscript could be acceptable for you. Revised sections are identified with yellow text in the paper.
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Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reply to Reviewer #1
Dear Reviewer,
Thank you very much for your time involved in reviewing the manuscript and your very encouraging comments on the merits.

Reviewer 1:
A VERY RARE CONDITION EXCELLENT CT IMAGES NICE INTRA-OPERATIVE IMAGE.

Reply to Reviewer #2
Dear Reviewer,
Thank you again for your positive comments and valuable suggestions to improve the quality of our manuscript. We have invited a friend of us who is a native English speaker to help polish our article. And We hope the revised manuscript could be acceptable for you. Revised sections have been identified with yellow text in the paper.

Comment 1:
Abstract: Page (P) 1 Line (L) 21: "examination revealed 3 days of hydrenephrosis in both kidneys", in the text is written that no pain has complained and absence of any symptoms. How and why bilateral hydrenephrosis was apprised?
Response 1:
Thanks for your suggestion. Maybe I did not describe it clearly. The patient had the history of double hydronephrosis, which was also treated by surgery (As shown in the Patient information) So the patient had been very worried about this problem and would have regular urological ultrasounds or CT examinations. he had a urological ultrasound routinely 3 days ago and found double hydronephrosis. As suggested by the reviewer, we have modified the sentence to ":with the chief complaint of hydronephrosis of both kidneys, which was discovered three days earlier through regular physical examination performed using urological ultrasound".

Comment 2:
P 2 L 31 "detached" in the manuscript is written that the ectopic penis was partially removed, this should be reported also in the abstract.  
Response 2:
Thanks for your very good question. we did overlook the problem. As suggested by the reviewer, we have revised the sentence in the abstract as "The ectopic penis was amputated and partially removed during the surgery."

Comment 3:
Introduction: P3 L 50 "To the best of our knowledge" is not evidence-based, did the authors perform a literature review to exclude the presence of other cases? If so, this sentence should be changed into, Based on the literature review on the following databases: PUBMED?EMBASE?, .......
Response 3:
Thanks for your suggestion. In fact, we have indeed conducted a large number of literature searches, mainly in the PubMed literature database. The main search words are "Penile Duplication" or "diphallia". As suggested by the reviewer, we have modified the sentence to "Mainly based on the literature review on PubMed database".

Comment 4:
Patient information: P 3 L 55 "examination revealed 3 days of hydronephrosis in both kidneys": same comments as above for P1 L 21 Family history is missing.
Response 4:
Thanks for your suggestion, As answered in comment 1, we have modified the sentence to "with the chief complaint of hydronephrosis of both kidneys, which was discovered three days earlier through regular physical examination performed using urological ultrasound", The family history really wasn’t mentioned, As suggested by the reviewer, we have added the sentence in Patient information as "The patient had no relevant family history".
Comment 5:
P3 L 55.58: "He had previously undergone ureteral stent placement on the right side due to bilateral hydronephrosis in January 2020. The bilateral ureteral stents were removed 3 months postoperatively." When did this happen? Was TC performed? Information about past illness is missing and also this part is unclear. Also, information about current other illnesses is missing.

Response 5:
Thanks for your suggestion. We did not describe the corresponding time point clearly. As suggested by the reviewer, we have modified the sentence in Patient information as "He had previously undergone ureteral stent placement on the right side due to bilateral hydronephrosis in January 2020. The rest of past history and current history of other diseases were not involved because they were all negative. As suggested by the reviewer, we have added the sentence to Patient information as "Other past history and current illnesses were all negative.",

Comment 6:
P3 L 66 "seminal vesicle gland to the left side" The authors used the singular form, was just one seminal vesicle gland displaced to the left side? or both were displaced to the left side? in this case, seminal vesicle gland"S" should be written

Response 6:
Thanks for your suggestion. We really didn’t realize that here. As suggested by the reviewer, we have revised the sentence as "….., and displacement of the seminal vesicle glands to the left side."

Comment 7:
P L 83 "partial excision of the pelvic mass was performed", as written above, also the abstract should report it.

Response 7:
Thanks for your suggestion. As answered in comment 2, we have added this section in the abstract as "The ectopic penis was amputated and partially removed during the surgery."