

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 80913

Title: Kidney stone matrix proteins: Their role in stone formation

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05821524

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: FACP, FASN, FEBS, FRCP, MBChB, MD

Professional title: Assistant Professor, Consultant Physician-Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iraq

Author's Country/Territory: Argentina

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-18

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-01 22:32

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-02 19:35

Review time: 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statementsConflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [**Y**] No**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1. Better to change the title as the current one may be mistaken for proteinuria in nephrolithiasis and this is a different entity. It at least should include the term (Urinary matrix Proteins). 2. The terms need to be unified. The authors described the proteins as inhibitors of crystallization at the initial part of introduction and then as matrix proteins later. The description and function need to be stated clearly . 3. Better to support with illustrations that support the actions and physiology. 4. I would love to know if nutritional habits have any effects on stone composition through the effect on theses proteins and not the crystals. Any relation with Citrate or K or Mg intake?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 80913

Title: Kidney stone matrix proteins: Their role in stone formation

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05379190

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: Argentina

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-18

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-07 20:40

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-07 21:00

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No
------------	---------------------------------------

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors published a review entitled 'Urinary Proteins in stone formation'. Urinary proteins have been extensively discussed. I suggest correcting the page layout and font size.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

Manuscript NO: 80913

Title: Kidney stone matrix proteins: Their role in stone formation

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: Argentina

Manuscript submission date: 2022-10-18

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-12-08 07:35

Reviewer performed review: 2022-12-16 10:01

Review time: 8 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1 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
figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with
labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and
accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? NA 9 Biostatistics. Does the
manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? NA 10 Units. Does the manuscript
meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11 References. Does the manuscript
appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction
and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite
references? Yes 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? Minimal grammar correction required.

Suggested in the proof returned. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, 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. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable? 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 The authors have presented a scientific review of the various macro molecules in the urine in relation to urinary stone formation. The references are mostly based on studies in animal models. During the last fifty years, much has been discussed about macromolecules and their role in urinary stone formation. However, no tangible result has emerged for the benefit of the clinician treating urinary stone patients. This aspect may be discussed in the paper.