



## 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

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://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

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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**

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?