

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10780

Title: Single Site Laparoscopic Partial Nephrectomy: where are we going?

Reviewer code: 00505695

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-04-19 16:54

Date reviewed: 2014-04-23 07:54

| 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 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

This is a reasonably well written review of LESS partial nephrectomy. It modestly adds to the literature. A few comments: 1. It seems to me rather arbitrary to exclude all multi-institutional studies- and also counter-intuitive. A logic should be provided for this. 2. There is a useful EAU recent guidelines released on the topic which could be commented on. 3. An update of the cited Kaouk multiinstitutional study is available and should be cited instead 4. It is a bit biased towards LESS. This should be softened. In my practice and opinion LESS is far from proven, and its only theoretical benefit is cosmesis. I use it only for young patients with a UPJ obstruction in whom cosmesis is quite important. The other major benefit is that those surgeons pushing the LESS envelope develop the cutting edge tools and techniques which let all surgeons advance. 5. There is some minor English language editing needed. 6. A pet peeve of mine- though a common mistake, a "steep" learning curve is easy, a "shallow" or "long" learning curve is difficult. Perhaps the authors should use "difficult" or "prolonged" instead of steep.

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10780

Title: Single Site Laparoscopic Partial Nephrectomy: where are we going?

Reviewer code: 00505691

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-04-19 16:54

Date reviewed: 2014-05-30 19:47

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

Very good review

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10780

Title: Single Site Laparoscopic Partial Nephrectomy: where are we going?

Reviewer code: 00503243

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-04-19 16:54

Date reviewed: 2014-06-01 23:07

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a minireview on a very important and actual issue. The review is complete, well written and worth to be published. Only a minor english revision needed. The only minor comment is the lacking in the references of PMID and DOI as the journal policy requires. I recommend that also this aspect should be reviewed by the authors

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10780

Title: Single Site Laparoscopic Partial Nephrectomy: where are we going?

Reviewer code: 00505671

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-04-19 16:54

Date reviewed: 2014-06-03 05:22

| 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 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 article is well-written. The main comments are: Material and methods. Would you be so kind to clarify the reason for choosing only the single-centre studies. It may be interesting to mention the inclusion criteria for considering patients for LESS-PN.