

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22248

Title: Sentinel lymph node biopsy in renal malignancy: The past, present and future

Reviewer's code: 02887546

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-08-25 19:57

Date reviewed: 2015-09-21 00:32

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

Comments by reviewer Paper may be accepted after revision. The paper is a review article on sentinel node biopsy in renal cancer, but the material is scattered all through the paper, so much so the reader does not comprehend the message in the paper. It would be good idea to recast the paper by writing about the other malignancies first and then mentioning about renal carcinoma. Minor grammatical corrections are noted in the text. Put full stop after every reference.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 22248

Title: Sentinel lymph node biopsy in renal malignancy: The past, present and future

Reviewer's code: 00608224

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-08-25 19:57

Date reviewed: 2015-10-08 18:00

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"/> 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

This article by Mahesan and colleagues is dealing with sentinel lymph node biopsy in renal cancer, an interesting and growing area in renal disease. Unfortunately, the presentation in its current form is more confusing than explanatory. Thus, the authors should introduce the concept of SLNB in other malignant tumors, in which this technique is clinically more advanced, in a first step and then refer in a second step to the specific situation in renal cancer.