

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Nephrology*

**Manuscript NO:** 80194

**Title:** Acute Kidney Injury Due to Bilateral Malignant Ureteral Obstruction: Is there an Optimal Mode of Drainage?

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03546647

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-09-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-09-20 18:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-09-20 19:24

**Review time:** 1 Hour

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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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

<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] Anonymous [ <input type="radio"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="radio"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="radio"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

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

The narrative review proposed by Gadelkareem et al is potentially interesting, focusing on a relevant topic. However, it lacks of supporting data and gives the feeling of a text book chapter for medical students. I would strongly suggest to include proper citations with larger amount of data and some comparative tables summarizing pros and cons of PCN vs JJ stenting. Also, I find some lexical choices rather questionable for a scientific journal.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Nephrology*

**Manuscript NO:** 80194

**Title:** Acute Kidney Injury Due to Bilateral Malignant Ureteral Obstruction: Is there an Optimal Mode of Drainage?

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03761355

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** FASN, FRCP, MD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-09-19

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-09-24 14:31

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-09-24 18:22

**Review time:** 3 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Peer-reviewer  
statements**

Peer-Review: [ ☒ ] Anonymous [ ☐ ] Onymous

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ☐ ] Yes [ ☒ ] No

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

In this review article, the authors discuss treatment options for obstructive uropathy related to malignancy which is an important topic. Over all article is written well. I would recommend abbreviating and streamlining the manuscript with more focus on available treatment modalities. It will be good to provide a table comparing the pros and cons of nephrostomy vs ureteral stent.