

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 78845

Title: Obstructive Uropathy – acute and chronic medical management

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02887546

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MAMS, MBBS, PhD

Professional title: Dean, Doctor, Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-02 10:25

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-10 11:57

Review time: 8 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods?

	<input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 78845

Title: Obstructive Uropathy – acute and chronic medical management

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05382551

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-17 23:24

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-18 13:18

Review time: 13 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods?

	<input type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

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. * The introduction should be expanded and better contextualize the scope in which the review is carried out. *It must be explained how the review was carried out, what type of review was carried out, sources consulted, selection criteria.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 78845

Title: Obstructive Uropathy – acute and chronic medical management

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06368967

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2022-08-31

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-17 06:27

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-18 15:44

Review time: 1 Day and 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Judgment by peer reviewers	Does this manuscript meet the code of ethics standards? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important novelty? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript have important creativity or innovation? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Does this manuscript use reliable research methods?

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [41] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [40] No Are the manuscript-accompanying data and figures authentic? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [51] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [50] No Does this manuscript make scientifically significant conclusions? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [61] Yes <input type="checkbox"/> [60] No
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations, it is a very complete review. I would add the possibility of hematuria ex-vacuo (following rapid bladder decompression) and its management. 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.