

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 45467

**Title:** Lump type crossed fused renal ectopia with bilateral vesicoureteral reflux: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00503175

**Reviewer's country:** Croatia

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2019-01-10

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-11

**Review time:** 14 Hours, 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have two minor revisions: 1. The fusion anomalies of the kidney are not anomalies of the descent but anomalies of the kidney ASCENT

=> Thanks for your sharp remark. I changed the term in the 'abstract' and



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

**‘introduction’. The modified revisions are highlighted in the manuscript.**

**2.The figures must be connected with the text.**

**=> I have noticed the problem, and detailed description was added in ‘figure 2’.**

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 45467

**Title:** Lump type crossed fused renal ectopia with bilateral vesicoureteral reflux: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00503257

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2019-01-10

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-12

**Review time:** 6 Hours, 2 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case report. I have a few concerns before consideration of publication. 1. It is unclear % of uptake in the DMSA renal scintigram in this patient. Whether the grade of uptake in the DMSA decreased? This issue should be clarified.

=> Thanks for your sincere review. The approximate degree of DMSA uptake was sufficient when compared with other normal kidneys. At initial diagnosis, the exact numerical value (%) was indeterminable. We added further description in the 'imaging examinations'. The modified revisions are highlighted in the manuscript.

2. In general, long-term outcome of renal function in patients with fused renal ectopia remains uncertain. This issue should be added.

=> We agree with your opinion, and there are few papers dealing with the long-term outcome of fused renal ectopia. Our paper provides the 6 year outcome after surgery, and it may be helpful to pediatric urologists. Due to lots of details, it was commented shortly in the 'discussion'.

3. How about renal function in this patient at the latest observation point?

=> Recently, the patient visited our center 6 years after operation. Serum creatinine level and US were examined and the results were described in the 'outcome and follow up'. The modified revisions are highlighted in the manuscript.

4. The volume of discussion section should be reduced concisely.

=> After re-inspection, we dropped some unnecessary part of 'discussion'. Most of them were duplicate descriptions.

#### INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

##### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

☐ No

***BPG Search:***

☐ The same title

☐ Duplicate publication

☐ Plagiarism

☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 45467

**Title:** Lump type crossed fused renal ectopia with bilateral vesicoureteral reflux: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00503199

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2019-01-10

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-13

**Review time:** 5 Hours, 3 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments of this reviewer are: - "CONCLUSION Early diagnosis and immediate surgical treatment are necessary to prevent urosepsis and preserve renal function."

Please change the conclusion in the abstract as it is misleading (immediate surgical



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://** www.wjgnet.com

treatment is not necessary in all cases of crossed fused renal ectopia) - Discussion:  
Mention how this case report adds in the existing literature

**=> Thanks for your sharp remark. We modified the conclusion in the 'abstract', not to misunderstand our intention. We also added exceptional points when compared with previous papers in the 'discussion'. The modified revisions are highlighted in the manuscript.**

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 45467

**Title:** Lump type crossed fused renal ectopia with bilateral vesicoureteral reflux: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00503254

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2019-01-10

**Date reviewed:** 2019-01-17

**Review time:** 18 Hours, 6 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This case report is clinically useful.

=> Thanks for your encouragement. We made our best efforts to write this paper.



## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No