

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 56702

**Title:** Retroperitoneal vs transperitoneal laparoscopic lithotripsy of 20-40 mm renal stones within horseshoe kidneys

**Reviewer's code:** 02507819

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FRCS (Gen Surg), MBBS, MD, MNAMS

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-05-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-05-23 15:24

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-05-28 04:22

**Review time:** 4 Days and 12 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This retrospective study compares retroperitoneal and transperitoneal approaches of laparoscopic pyelolithotomy in horse shoe kidney. According to this study, there is no difference in two approaches other than mean post-operative fasting time. I want to know whether authors encountered any intra-renal pelvis and if yes, what were the problems faced and how did they manage? What was the size of double J ureteral stent used?