

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12222

Title: Anatomic nephrolithotomy revisited: are we really healing our patients?

Reviewer code: 00723046

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-29 16:42

Date reviewed: 2014-08-29 03:34

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"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The papers review the treatment for staghorn stones. It describes the anatomic lithotomy, percutaneous lithotomy and a comparison between them, but with an authors prevalence over the anatomic procedure. As review of literature it is fine but nowadays there is a clear predominance (widely described in international guidelines) of the percutaneous procedure. Currently, Anatomic approach is very limited. So, I wouldn't say it is an interesting paper however as a review of the staghorn topic it is correct.

ESPS PEER REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 12222

Title: Anatomic nephrolithotomy revisited: are we really healing our patients?

Reviewer code: 00503175

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2014-06-29 16:42

Date reviewed: 2014-08-30 13:31

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"/> 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Existing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Review article "A review on renal recovery after anatomic nephrolithotomy: are we really healing our patients?" by Abreu et al. is according to my opinion, acceptable for publication but after revision. REVISIONS 1. Since this is review article I suggest to authors that in treatment modalities of staghorn calculus mention ESWL and RIRS (retrograde intrarenal surgery) as possible adjunct to main procedure. 2. In the table 1 there are two unexplained abbreviations: st (?) and mod (?). 3. The text needs little language polishing as in the Abstract section THEN instead of THEM.