

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8634

**Title:** SIMULTANEOUS BILATERAL ROBOTIC PARTIAL NEPHRECTOMY: CASE REPORT AND CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE TECHNIQUE.

**Reviewer code:** 02446773

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-31 20:35

**Date reviewed:** 2013-12-31 21:29

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

very well written and interesting case. I enjoyed reading it. I have a few minor comments: 1. is this the first procedure of its kind? 2. would it be possible to upload a video of this procedure along with the case report (only if technology permits!)

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 8634

**Title:** SIMULTANEOUS BILATERAL ROBOTIC PARTIAL NEPHRECTOMY: CASE REPORT AND CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE TECHNIQUE.

**Reviewer code:** 01212783

**Science editor:** Qi, Yuan

**Date sent for review:** 2013-12-31 20:35

**Date reviewed:** 2014-01-08 21:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Referee's report for: SIMULTANEOUS BILATERAL ROBOTIC PARTIAL NEPHRECTOMY: CASE REPORT AND CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE TECHNIQUE. This paper is relevant to the journal but presents previously reported information and concepts. Manuscript Title The title of the paper is appropriate as it reflects accurately its coverage. Abstract The abstract is concise and relevant but suffers grammatical errors. Key Words - Key words are adequate and appropriate. Introduction The introduction outlines concisely the clinical condition reported on but suffers from minor grammatical errors. These should be corrected. Case presentation The description is adequate but suffers from a lot of grammatical errors. These need to be corrected before publication. For example, "As regards the history, the patient did not undergo any previous surgical operation" should be "There was no past surgical history." The general physical examination and the preoperative exams were regular" should be "General physical and pre-operative examinations were normal. The "operatory room " should be "Operating theatre", "A 30° lens looking down" was used, should be "A 30° angle lens was used" and many others. Investigations These were not reported and should be included Differential diagnosis This was not mentioned specifically in the body of the manuscript but included under the "Comments" and it is unclear why this should be the case. The differential diagnosis should be included in the body of the manuscript under "case report." Treatment and surgical procedures These were appropriate and described in detail. Discussion The discussion is adequate and relevant but again suffers from grammatical errors. These need to be corrected before publication. Conclusion: The conclusion is concise, relevant and backed up by the data Images The images are necessary, adequate and informative. References The list of references



## **Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

---

is relevant and adequate.      Writing style Minor correction required