

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7987

Title: The recent management of urinary stone disease in pediatric population

Reviewer code: 00505626

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-11 13:03

Date reviewed: 2013-12-12 22:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article about the recent trends in management of pediatric urolithiasis. The manuscript is good and comprehensive and the references are updated. Some points need to be clarified: 1- In the section of ESWL, a. the value of NCCT in predicting success of ESWL in children should be high lightened [suggested reference: Urology. 2013 Apr;81(4):880-4. Kidney stone size and hounsfield units predict successful shockwave lithotripsy in children.] b. Recent reports about long term effects of ESWL in children should be added [suggested reference: BJU Int. 2013 Apr;111(4):666-71. Are there long-term effects of extracorporeal shockwave lithotripsy in paediatric patients?] 2- in the section of PCNL: c. The safety of supracostal puncture in children should be discussed [suggested reference: J Urol. 2008 Aug;180(2):676-80. Safety and efficacy of supracostal percutaneous nephrolithotomy in pediatric patients.] d. The comparison between PCNL and ESWL in treating stone in children should be discussed [suggested reference: J Urol. 2006 Aug;176(2):706-10. Treatment of renal stones in children: a comparison between percutaneous nephrolithotomy and shock wave lithotripsy.]

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7987

Title: The recent management of urinary stone disease in pediatric population

Reviewer code: 00646230

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-11 13:03

Date reviewed: 2013-12-14 02:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input 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	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

This manuscript is about urinary stones in children. Although the subject is very important, we have two queries before publication: - The English should be thoroughly revised. - Most references are out of date, so the authors should add more recent references.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7987

Title: The recent management of urinary stone disease in pediatric population

Reviewer code: 00503175

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-11 13:03

Date reviewed: 2013-12-15 14:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Manuscript "The recent management of urinary stone disease in pediatric population" by Aydogdu et al. before publication need some revision. Suggestions: 1.First, in the first page I suggest that affiliation names are written in different way: "Address: Department of Urology, Medical Park Izmir Hospital, Yeni Girne blv. 1825 sk 12 Kirsiyaka, Izmir Turkey". 2.Second, the all text must be revised by native english speaker. According to my experience the best way is to use some professional agency with experience in medical english. 3.Some minor errors: In Section ESWL %92 instead 92%; In Ureterorenoscopy section literature (1,7,13, and 31) instead (1,7,13, 31) 4.In section Ureterorenoscopy (URS) authors stated: "There was a concern regarding the use of URS in children with urinary stones due to potential complications including ureteral ischemia, urethral stricture..." Probably they think ureteral stricture. 5.The literature is not written in one, standard, consistent way.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Pediatrics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 7987

Title: The recent management of urinary stone disease in pediatric population

Reviewer code: 00467918

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-12-11 13:03

Date reviewed: 2013-12-17 03:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

This is a review of current minimally invasive management of stone disease in pediatric population. Language: English of the manuscript need substantial revision by a native speaker. Even the title needs to be corrected (eg recent instead of current). Title: Only ESWL and surgical treatment of urolithiasis is being described and not other aspects of management (metabolic evaluation, conservative treatment including watchful waiting and medical expulsive treatment, follow up protocols etc). Consequently authors either should expand their review (to all kinds of management) or should change their title to "Current minimally invasive management of stone disease in pediatric population". Literature: The interpretation of reference number 2 is not correct. Afshar et al, reported that 69% of the cases with residual stone fragments had symptoms or increase in stone size. The authors state that ESWL is the treatment of choice in stones of the upper tract smaller than 1.5 cm. In contrast, Smaldone et al concluded that for the same stones URS should be the first choice. Authors should comment on this. Any comparative studies? The interpretation of the reference number 33 is quite biased. According to referenced manuscript, 4 cases were converted from rigid to flex URS so the reported 100% of success in rigid URS is wrong. Please correct. Again the interpretation of the reference number 37 is wrong. According to the reference the maximum stone size was 16mm and more than 50% of the reported cases with stones bigger than 6 mm needed additional measures. Please correct Regarding the reference number 40, authors should state that the referring cases were not suitable for PCNL or ESWL. LAP pyelolithotomy cannot be considered as a first line approach in uncomplicated pediatric cases. Further comments Overall, this is a relative superficial review. In order authors to increase its value should add 1) And description and adequate references on the difference between pediatric and adult stone recurrence. 2) information regarding the role of



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

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

metabolic factor as a predominant risk factor in pediatric stone disease. 3) information regarding comparative studies between the different approaches in terms of morbidity, stone free rates and expenses. 4) And finally authors should add a small paragraph regarding their own experience and protocol within the described wide armamentarium of available treatment options.