

REVIEWERS COMMENTS AND AUTHOR'S ANSWERS

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 12222

REVIEWER 1

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.

DONE

2. In the table 1 there are two unexplained abbreviations: st (?) and mod (?).

DONE

3. The text needs little language polishing as in the Abstract section THEN instead of THEM.

DONE

REVIEWER 2

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.

OK