

**ESPS Peer-review Report****Name of Journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10086**Title:** Kidney stones over 2 cm in diameter - between guidelines and individual approach**Reviewer code:** 00503322**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia**Date sent for review:** 2014-03-12 10:44**Date reviewed:** 2014-03-31 18:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" 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 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)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors have presented an excellent review on the management of renal calculi over 2 cm diameter and discusses the advantages and disadvantages of individual treatment modalities in keeping with the European Association of Urology guidelines. The paper does carry an educational value in terms of updates on the practice of management of renal calculi. There are a few minor amendments those need to be done before accepting the paper for publication. 1. In the introduction section, it would be necessary to mention the aim and objectives of the paper. 2. A method section stating literature search strategy would be appropriate. 3. Addition of a logical conclusion would impart the paper a better finish rather than an abrupt ending. 4. The Table-1 needs to be references as the source remains unidentified. 5. The style of the references need attention. The dates of publication in several references are either in the middle or at the end. The references citing "websites" should have last accessed date mentioned. In essence, the review does provide useful information to the practicing clinicians and trainees, hence should be considered for publication once the recommended amendments are made.

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 10086

**Title:** Kidney stones over 2 cm in diameter - between guidelines and individual approach

**Reviewer code:** 02459176

**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia

**Date sent for review:** 2014-03-12 10:44

**Date reviewed:** 2014-04-01 18:55

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)		BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

1.The manuscript should be polished for reading. 2. Hope to see you more and better research.