

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**Manuscript NO:** 36910

**Title:** Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio in the management and prediction of outcomes in renal cell carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 00740391

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-06

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-06

**Review time:** 1 Hour

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your submission. There are a few aspects which are lacking in this submission - 1. detailed material and methods - how was a search done, using what search engine and over what time period 2. a consort diagram to define how studies were included. Where there any studies which were excluded 3. a paragraph on the limitations of the article - cut off values, heterogeneous cohort, small volume of cases, TNM stage, what is the correlation between the NLR ratio and OS vs disease specific survival 4. it is hard to draw an inference from these low volume heterogenous studies where retrospective data 5. what is the effect of confounders and bias in the studies. The authors need to highlight these issues in the article.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**Manuscript NO:** 36910

**Title:** Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio in the management and prediction of outcomes in renal cell carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 00505686

**Reviewer's country:** Turkey

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-06

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-12

**Review time:** 5 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

this study is valuable

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**Manuscript NO:** 36910

**Title:** Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio in the management and prediction of outcomes in renal cell carcinoma

**Reviewer's code:** 005075

**Reviewer's country:** Croatia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-11-16

**Date reviewed:** 2017-11-16

**Review time:** 16 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Article „ Neutrophil-lymphocyte ratio in the management and prediction of outcomes in renal cell carcinoma“, according to my opinion, is acceptable for publication but after minor revisions: 1.In the Introduction section authors stated ...translocation carcinoma... but cancer is not translocated but have a translocation. So I suggest: ...renal carcinoma with translocation... 2.Language polishing is needed.