

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20610

Title: Upper tract urothelial carcinoma: Paradigm shift towards nephron sparing management

Reviewer's code: 00723046

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-15 11:49

Date reviewed: 2015-06-17 05:49

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I propose some considerations to take into account in order to be published: 1. It is a nice topic and it is controversial, good election. 2. It is not structured as the standard manuscripts: introduction-M&M-discussion-conclusion. 3. Introduction: delete the last 3 lines, it is a pretentious opinion. 4. Page 5: "urologists...for UTUC?": The reason the natural aggressive behavior of UUT Carcinoma, one more time it is a pretentious opinion. 5. Page 5: "a segmental ureterectomy...further here": why? then change the title of the review to endoscopic management and not "nephron sparing" because it is a part of it. 6. Page 8: "as the systematic review...": This article is not a systematic review, it is not described the method, the protocol, the screening form, the data extraction and so on. IT is not structured like this so it is a "non systematic literature review" 7. The conclusion are in grade with EAU guidelines to perform non invasive treatment for UUT carcinoma, no news. 8. references: the letters don't have the same pattern. It seems to much references. Some of them have 1 author et al, some of them 2 authors et al. some of them 3 authors et al. you must fit it.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 20610

Title: Upper tract urothelial carcinoma: Paradigm shift towards nephron sparing management

Reviewer's code: 00505679

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-15 11:49

Date reviewed: 2015-06-23 23:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The topic is very interesting and is currently under discussion. There are a number of issues that should be clarified by the authors to enhance this good work. It is necessary to define the methodology made during the review and the time covered, it can not be defined as a "systematically review" without knowing the methodology. -In the section "nephron sparing treatments for UTUC" the second paragraph needs of references, because otherwise seems more a personal opinions. -The References are not properly made.