



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 74024

**Title:** Application of a Novel Computer-Assisted Surgery System in Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy: A Controlled Study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04729411

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-06 13:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-06 16:23

**Review time:** 3 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<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](https://www.wjgnet.com)

<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
-------------------------------------	---

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Deae Authors, Thank you for sharing your experience.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 74024

**Title:** Application of a Novel Computer-Assisted Surgery System in Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy: A Controlled Study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02534290

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Professor, Surgeon, Surgical Oncologist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-23 14:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-26 09:31

**Review time:** 2 Days and 19 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 type="checkbox"/> ] Anonymous [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ <input type="checkbox"/> ] Yes [ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ] No
-------------------------------------	---

### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors discuss how percutaneous nephrolithotomy is still a great challenge for surgeons because of poor comprehension on complex adjacent structures and how novel techniques are required in planning and navigation, like Hisense computed-assisted surgery (CAS). They conclude that CAS-assisted PCNL has advantages in terms of puncturing success rate and stone-free rate and that this system is recommended to assist preoperative planning and intraoperative navigation for an intuitive, precise and convenient PCNL. The title correctly reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study and describes the methods used in adequate detail. I conclude that the research objectives are achieved by the experiments in this study. The manuscript interprets the finding adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically and the findings are stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussions are accurate and clear. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The style, language and grammar is accurate and appropriate. My assessment is that the overall quality of this article is excellent and should be accepted for publishing with high priority.



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 74024

**Title:** Application of a Novel Computer-Assisted Surgery System in Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy: A Controlled Study

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05339586

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-12-13

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-01-22 20:41

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-01-29 02:11

**Review time:** 6 Days and 5 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 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 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
---------------------------------	---

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study is original, provides a novel technology for increasing the precision of percutaneous nephrothotomy (PNL). However, there are many concerns should be addressed through the following sections: 1) Title: Ok. 2) Abstract: -Revise for writing: avoid starting sentences with numbers. 3) Core tip: -Mention most important and specific results. -Mention the full term of each abbreviation used. 4) Introduction: Ok. 5) Materials and Methods: -The type of the study is not clear whether it is a retrospective one. -Contrast CT is not a routine work for diagnosis of stones. if this study was a retrospective one, how can you explain that all patients had enhanced CT? -The expression (patients who met the inclusion and exclusion criteria and ) is not accurate. Instead, use the expression (patients who met the selection criteria). -The criteria of determination of the calyx of entry may not allow the chance for making a shortest puncture path. So, you should clarify that the shortest path not relative to the whole calyces, but it is relative to this calyx. -There is no idea about the costs of this system. -The system seems to be complex. Is there any way to simplify it? -Revise for writing: for example, terms such as under US supervision, conclusion of surgery are inaccurately used in this section. punctuation use needs revision. -Regarding grades of complications, the use of the term severe complications to refer Clavien-Dindo grade  $\geq 2$  seems to be inaccurate. clarify. 6) Results: -The difference in decrease of hemoglobin is not equal. The non-significant values may be in doubtful. -The use of the word respectively seems to be inaccurate at the last paragraph of Results. 7) Discussion and Conclusions: Ok. 8) Tables: Table 1; What do you mean by diameter of the collecting system? Capitalize the words hounsfield unit (Hounsfield Unit). 7) Figures: Ok. 8) References list: Ok.



**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](https://www.wjgnet.com)