

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87235

Title: BLADDER STONE DUE TO LATE CLIP MIGRATION AFTER PROSTATIC URETHRAL LIFT PROCEDURE: A CASE REPORT

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02583793

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Reviewer_Country

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-30

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-05 14:36

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-05 14:42

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 Grade E: Do not publish |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |



**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

| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input 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 |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting case report, informative with good discription and photographs.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87235

Title: BLADDER STONE DUE TO LATE CLIP MIGRATION AFTER PROSTATIC URETHRAL LIFT PROCEDURE: A CASE REPORT

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: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-30

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-08-18 14:43

Reviewer performed review: 2023-08-27 02:03

Review time: 8 Days and 11 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 |
| Novelty of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty |
| Creativity or innovation of this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation |

| | |
|---|--|
| Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance |
| 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 statements | 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 case is interesting and novel with expected benefits to the readers. However, there are many concerns that should be addressed. It would be more interesting to provide: 1) More specific data about the case in the abstract. The main bulk of the abstract should be specific to the case and its findings and management. 2) The complaint of the patient and its duration at the first sentence of the Case presentation section. Use the CARE criteria. 3) The physical examination findings of this old patient: general and local. 4) Laboratory workups such as urine analysis, hemoglobin level, blood sugar, bleeding profile, etc. 5) Reduction of the use of the terms such as (our) and (we), (thier) and use the passive form instead, such as (In this study, it was found ; A study byet al. showed 6) Correct scientific terms to replace terms as (endoscopic cystolithotomy; to be endoscopic cystolithotripsy) and (controles of the patient). These terms are not correctly used. 7) Remove the the first sentence of the conclusion because it is not relevant to the current case. Reformulate the conclusion and provide only the findings from the current case, but not general conclusions. 8) Revision for language polishing.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 87235

Title: BLADDER STONE DUE TO LATE CLIP MIGRATION AFTER PROSTATIC URETHRAL LIFT PROCEDURE: A CASE REPORT

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: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: Turkey

Manuscript submission date: 2023-07-30

Reviewer chosen by: Xin-Liang Qu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-09-06 12:15

Reviewer performed review: 2023-09-06 16:43

Review time: 4 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 |
| Peer-reviewer | Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors responded to comments with correction of some points. However and unfortunately, they failed to respond satisfactorily to other comments, especially to providing the physical examination and laboratory findings of this old patient. Even they were within normal, examination and laboratory findings are essential workups that should be mentioned clearly but not as a negating statement only. At least, the digital rectal examination (DRE) and urine analysis findings would be mentioned. As they were normal, what are your explanations for these negative findings in the context of the symptoms, presence of an obstructing stone in the bladder neck by computed tomography, and previous TURP? (Provide these explanations in the Discussion section)

In addition, still there are multiple incorrect terms need revision; The term prothatic (should be prostatic); pneumatics (should be pneumatic lithotripter); prostate (TUR) or TUR prostatectomy; should be TURP), etc.