

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I read the manuscript written by Gou JJ and others with great interest. In my honest opinion, the topic is interesting and the retrospectively studies novel enough to attract the readers' attention. They successfully predicted high-risk patients by establishing a risk model, which was beneficial to clinical and targeted treatment and prevention. Title: Appropriate. It reflects the main content of the study. Authorship: Is correct. Institutions: are correct. Abstract: Is a structured abstract according to the required format. In 263 words authors showed a summary of the content of the manuscript. Key words: 4 that reflect the content of the study. However, I suggest adding another 3-5 keywords that reflect the theme. Core Tip: In 78 words authors reflect properly aspects that should call attention to the readers. Background: Urinary sepsis is frequently seen in patients with DM complicated with upper urinary tract calculi. Currently, the known risk factors of urinary sepsis are not uniform. Method: Authors made the detailed description of the investigations. Results: The author clearly presents the data to be observed in the method. Discussion: Authors made a detailed and informative discussion of the results. Illustrations: They show 1 figure and 5 tables with their corresponding legend. All figure and tables are showing clearly making and adequate support of the results. Biostatistics: This work met the requirements of biostatistics. References: The references are quite appropriate to the subject of research. Comments to the author: In this manuscript authors investigate the risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with diabetes mellitus comorbid with upper urinary tract calculi and construct a risk prediction model. Their findings are helpful to identify high-risk patients at an early stage and implement active and effective intervention measures to reduce complications and improve the prognosis of patients.

Re: Thank you for your valuable feedback on our manuscript. We appreciate your positive comments regarding the topic and novelty of our study. We have addressed the suggestion to add additional keywords that reflect the theme of our research. We agree that including more keywords will enhance the searchability and relevance of our study. Thank you for recognizing the potential clinical implications of our findings in identifying high-risk patients and implementing effective intervention measures. We have considered your comments and made the necessary revisions to improve the manuscript. We appreciate your recommendation for publication.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: In the manuscript "Risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with diabetes mellitus comorbid with upper urinary tract calculi", the authors tried to analyze the risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with DM

complicated with UUTCs by logistic regression. Until now, the risk factors for concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with UUTCs and DM are still under investigation. Gou JJ et al. performed a single-center retrospective study of 204 patients with DM complicated with UUTCs. They successfully predicted high-risk patients by establishing a risk model, which was beneficial to clinical and targeted treatment and prevention. Finally, they revealed that gender, age, history of lumbago and abdominal pain, operation time, U-LEU and U-GLU were independent risk factors for concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with DM and UUTCs. The topic of this work is interesting. Their conclusion might provide additional information for clinical diagnosis and treatment of DM and UUTCs. The manuscript is well written and well organized, and authors presented also the limitations of the study. I recommend that the manuscript can be published.

Re: We would like to express our gratitude for your thoughtful evaluation of our manuscript. We are pleased to know that you found our work interesting and well-written. We appreciate your acknowledgement of the importance of our research in analyzing the risk factors of concurrent urinary sepsis in patients with diabetes mellitus and upper urinary tract calculi. Your recognition of the potential clinical implications of our risk prediction model is encouraging. We have taken note of your comments regarding the well-organized structure and the presentation of the limitations of our study. We have carefully considered your feedback and made the necessary revisions. We sincerely thank you for recommending our manuscript for publication.