

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12082

Title: From crystalluria to kidney stones, some physicochemical aspects of calcium nephrolithiasis, ID: 02887513

Reviewer code: 00352837

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-22 22:20

Date reviewed: 2014-06-25 10:49

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Baumann et al reviewed the physicochemical aspects of calcium nephrolithiasis. Although this review contains interesting mechanism of crystal aggregation in kidney, I am afraid that readers in this journal may be not interested in this version. For example, authors should mention to the interventional therapy for calcium nephrolithiasis, in association with the mechanism. In addition, it is not clear whether figures in this manuscript were reproduced from other journal or new figure. If figures are new ones, authors explain more in detail.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12082

Title: From crystalluria to kidney stones, some physicochemical aspects of calcium nephrolithiasis, ID: 02887513

Reviewer code: 00503322

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-22 22:20

Date reviewed: 2014-07-04 19:43

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have written a detailed review on the physiochemical aspects and mechanism of renal stone formation commencing with crystalluria. However, the focus is mainly on calcium oxalate stones and not others. It would be appropriate to include other types of stones as well, at least briefly. The review does have significant educational value and should be considered for publication in the WJN. However, it would be appropriate to make some amendments and also to clarify certain queries prior to acceptance. 1. The abstract is too long (194 words) and does not provide the actual aim of the review. 2. The manuscript itself is too lengthy (6848 words) and cumbersome for the readers, which needs to be shortened to less than 5000 words. 3. Regarding 12 figures depicted in the manuscript, it is important to clarify whether these figures are authors' actual work or copied from various sources. If it is the latter, the source and authorisation for publication should be mentioned. 4. Majority of references are old and attention needs to be focussed in including more recent published references. 1. The abstract is too long (194 words) and does not provide the actual aim of the review. 2. The manuscript itself is too lengthy (6848 words) and cumbersome for the readers, which needs to be shortened to less than 5000 words. 3. Regarding 12 figures depicted in the manuscript, it is important to clarify whether these figures are authors' actual work or copied from various sources. If it is the latter, the source and authorisation for publication should be mentioned. 4. Majority of references are old and attention needs to be focussed in including more recent published references.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12082

Title: From crystalluria to kidney stones, some physicochemical aspects of calcium nephrolithiasis, ID: 02887513

Reviewer code: 00503014

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-06-22 22:20

Date reviewed: 2014-07-09 22:29

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"/> Existing	<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"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It is a good writing and review. I do not have any comments for the manuscript.