Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

December 6, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 13099-edited2.doc).

Title: Strategies to Optimize Shock Wave Lithotripsy Outcome: Patient Selection and Treatment Parameters

Author: Michelle Jo Semins, Brian R Matlaga

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Nephrology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 13099

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:
1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

(1) ***Reviewed by 00729478 – accepted, no revisions recommended***

(2) ***Reviewed by 02519158***

This article concern the practical problem of optimization of shock wave lithotripsy and therefore it could be interesting for clinicians who in their practice use this treatment method, especially for clinical urologists. However, this article is written too tritely, e.g. statistical analyses are not presented extensively. I suggest to expand this part of article to deliver statistical data for justification of separated medical decisions. Apart from this I suggest also to present the SWL optimization in form of algorithm to make it more available for readers. After such adequate revision, this paper can play an important role as a source of practical knowledge for clinical urologists. However, I cannot recommend this artcle for publication in World Journal of Nephrology in the current form.

Response: Unfortunately no additional statistical analysis beyond the current literature reviewed is available. Certainly further studies are needed with more meta-analyses and randomized controlled trials. We could certainly the actual statistics from each article reviewed into the manuscript but this would take up a lot of extra text and the review was designed to be easy to read and give a generalized view of the topic addressed for the target audience which is nephrologists, not urologists. Please let us know if you would like us to breakdown the literature reviewed and put in detailed numbers from the individual 60 papers reviewed. Otherwise, the references are there for those readers that would like more detailed information about each study.

Algorithm – Tables 1-4 have been added to suggest an algorithm in decision-making

(3) ***Reviewed by 00503255***

The authors reviewed patient selection utilizing stone characteristics and patient feature, and technical parameters during shock wave lithotripsy (SWL) to optimize SWL outcome. This paper is well-written and narrative review article with some educational values. 1. Put reference numbers in square brackets in superscript at the end of citation content or after the cited author's name. 2. The reference style the authors used is not appropriate for this journal. Please read the instructions to authors of this journal and correct references. In addition, pleased provide PubMed citation numbers to the reference list, if available. For example, reference No 1, "J Urol 186, 140-150 (2011)" should be changed to "J Urol 2011;186: 140-150 [PMID: 21575964 DOI: 10.1016/j.juro.2011.03.018]"

Response: These changes have been made – if no numbers are given they were unable to be found.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Nephrology*.

Sincerely yours,

Michelle Jo Semins, MD
Brian R Matlaga, MD, MPH
600 N. Wolfe Street
Baltimore, MD 21287
Fax: 410 502-7711
E-mail: bmatlaga@jhmi.edu, mjsemins@gmail.com