

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67178

Title: Retroperitoneal laparoscopic partial nephrectomy for unilateral synchronous multifocal renal carcinoma with different pathological types: A case report

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: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-17 12:12

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-17 13:08

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" 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
https://www.wjgnet.com

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?
NA 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 of the
paper contents? Yes Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better
legends? No 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics?
No 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11
References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and
authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Yes Does the
author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? No 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? Yes 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared
their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as



**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

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. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? 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

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 67178

Title: Retroperitoneal laparoscopic partial nephrectomy for unilateral synchronous multifocal renal carcinoma with different pathological types: A case report

Reviewer's code: 01221666

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-17 12:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-18 04:23

Review time: 16 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The case report presented two synchronous RCCs in one kidney and the patient received partial nephrectomy successfully. Comments 1. Are the diagnosis of synchronous renal carcinoma with different histological presentation diagnosed before surgery? Does the difference make surgical decision (partial or total nephrectomy) different? 2. Any risk factors for this synchronous RCCs with different types? Does the difference carry any clinical significance? 3. Figures are not uploaded, which prevent further review 4. Page 8 "In China, the retroperitoneal approach is usually adopted, while the retroperitoneal route is often chosen in Western countries." Do you really mean that?