

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77857

Title: Renal pseudoaneurysm after rigid ureteroscopic lithotripsy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06277687

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MM

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-26 14:05

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-28 08:27

Review time: 1 Day and 18 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
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	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases Manuscript Type: CASE REPORT

77857-Comment: 1. Whether the patient has a history of trauma should be noted. Is extracorporeal shock wave lithotripsy an iatrogenic injury? Is the possibility of causing a renal pseudoaneurysm. 2. Renal function indicators should be supplemented. And the patient's smoking and drinking habits. 3. Whether the patient has taken oral anticoagulants should be indicated. Is there any correlation between the abnormality of APTT and the formation of renal pseudoaneurysm? The mechanism of repair after artery injury can be discussed. 4. Page 9 "According to our literature review, Multiple aneurysms within one kidney are less common than in solitary renal lesions." Please supplement literature as references. 5. References should be marked above text.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77857

Title: Renal pseudoaneurysm after rigid ureteroscopic lithotripsy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06299707

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-27 07:35

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-29 11:32

Review time: 2 Days and 3 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

dear authors: Renal pseudoaneurysm after rigid ureteroscopic lithotripsy, could be an interesting case to report, as you alluded in this article. It is worth noting that, the discussion section is rich and well arranged. However, before it becomes publishable, it still requires some improvement. Here are my comments: 1.Title is one of the most impressive part of any articles, thus You can dedicate a more attractive title for your manuscript. 2.The background section has been written simply. It is incomplete and does not cover all of your research ingredients, and also, the importance of your article is not prominent enough. In this section, you must create an explicit view of why you are directed to write this topic. 3.You have claimed, that this is the first case report about renal pseudoaneurysm after URSL, but there is a report which has addressed beneath: □Jubber I, Patel PR, Hori S, Al-Hayek S. Renal pseudoaneurysm: a rare and potentially fatal complication following ureteroscopy and laser fragmentation of stones. The Annals of The Royal College of Surgeons of England. 2018 Mar;100(3):e51-2. Case history section, L5 «Rigid and flexible ureteroscopy and laser fragmentation of the stones using an access sheath were performed » 4. Keywords should represent key concepts and should reflect a collective understanding of the topic. For determining the correct and most appropriate keywords, you can use Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) or Google Keyword Planner. 5.sentences in the introduction section have been left without references, also the constructs and concepts in the introduction section are poor-organized and incomplete. Include more general and specific background in this section. 6.For the Laboratory examinations, it is more suitable to design a table. 7.Most bibliographic citations which been used are more than 5 years old and obsolete. The authors must update and arrange the bibliography. 8.There are a lot of punctuation

errors, in the entire of the manuscript. 9.The manuscript must be revised, in regarding spelling, grammar and syntax. This is an example of incorrect grammar «Urothelial mucosal damage or cavitation bubbles was suspected»

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 77857

Title: Renal pseudoaneurysm after rigid ureteroscopic lithotripsy: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06299707

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-25

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Ping Yan

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-29 11:53

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-29 21:08

Review time: 9 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
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
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

Dear authors: Most of the comments have been responded, and the majority of revises have been accomplished appropriately. However, before it becomes publishable, it still requires some revisions. Here are my comments: 1.The background of the study provides context to the information that you are discussing in your paper generally, and it is kind of overall view of your manuscript. The background should be written as a summary of your interpretation of previous research and what your study proposes to accomplish. There is no need to be specified on detailed description. Also note the importance of your study clearly.(the background was short and simple before, and now some sentences are not suitable in background section, and are confusing) 2.Some part of the revised background can be alluded in the introduction section, in addition this part does not require to be referenced. 3.Still, sentences in the introduction section have left without references as it was before, also the constructs and concepts in the introduction section are poor-organized and incomplete again. Like I have implied before, include more general and specific information in this section. 4.You can still dedicate the newest possible bibliography to the manuscript, specially in introduction section. Your revision regarding this section was pleasant, but still you can even compare your study with the newest relevant researches. Strive more again to update the bibliography as much as you can.