Nephro-Urology Monthly
Volume 15 · Issue 2 · e137474

OPEN PEER REVIEW

Comparison of Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy Success Rate and Complications in Patients with a History of Different Therapeutic Interventions for Kidney Stone

Saman Farshid, Mohammadreza Tayyeb Ghasemi, Mansour Alizadeh

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
9 May 2023	9 Jul 2023	16 Jul 2023	10.5812/numonthly-137474

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 **Original submission** Referee 1, Associate Editor 2
2 **Revision 1** Referee 1, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 6
3 **Revision 2** Associate Editor 7
Authors' reply to reviewers 8
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

2 comments · 3 Jun 2023 – 4 Jun 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 3 Jun 2023

1. What is your study type? Please mention it in the methods and abstract sections.
2. There are several spelling and grammatical errors within the manuscript that need to be corrected. Please consider the English quality of the manuscript again and revise it accordingly.
3. Please make the fonts and spacing between words consistent throughout the manuscript.
4. Abstract: The authors introduce the term ESWL for the first time and need to expand the abbreviation here.
5. Please use one of the abbreviations PCNL or PNL consistently throughout the text.
6. Please check your keywords against the MeSH database. It seems that the keywords need some revisions.
7. The Introduction is so weak. Please discuss the necessity of the study, previous research, …
8. It is better to use a schematic diagram to show the study and group divisions for easy understanding by the reader.
9. Was informed consent obtained from the patients?
10. Disclose the authors' conflicts of interest.
11. Please give details regarding post-intervention examinations.
12. The authors include a good number of references but may need to focus on some of them to give an in-depth discussion. You should provide comprehensive and reliable comparisons between your findings and those of previous studies.

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 4 Jun 2023

Minor Revision

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editorial Team of Nephro-Urology Monthly Journal

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled " **Comparison of Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy Success Rate and Complications in Patients with a History of Different Therapeutic Interventions for Kidney Stone** " Nephro-Urology Monthly Journal. I appreciate the time and effort that you have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I have highlighted the changes within the manuscript and replied to the comments in this file.

Responses to comments:

1. What is your type of study? please mentioned it in method and abstract sections.

Response: We thank you for pointing this comment out. We added type of the study to the Method and Introduction section and highlighted them in the manuscript. .

2- ***There are several spelling and grammatical errors within the manuscript, which need to be revised in right order. Please consider the English quality of the manuscript again and revise it accordingly.***

Response: All parts of the manuscript were edited again by an English language expert.

3- ***Please match the fonts and spaces between words in some parts throughout the manuscript.***

Response: This comment was checked and edited too.

4- ***Abstract: The authors introduce the term ESWL for the first time, and need expand the abbreviation here.***

Response: Thank you to referring to this point. The abbreviation was completely written and highlighted in the text.

5- ***Please include one of the abbreviations PCNL or PNL throughout the text.***

Response: It was also corrected and through the text this abbreviation was used instead of its complete form.

6- ***Please check your Keywords with Mesh data base. It seems that the keywords need some revisions.***

Response: All the keywords were written according to Mesh.

7- ***The Introduction is so weak. Please discuss more about necessity, previous study, …***

Response: According to this comment the needed parts were added and highlighted in the text.

8- It is better to use a schematic diagram to show the study and group divisions for easy understanding for the reader.

Response: Thank you for pointing this comment but there are more variables according to postoperative outcomes that were compared among the four groups and all are important. Then to which ones do you want us to draw diagram?

9- ***There was informed consent from patients?***

Response: Because this study was a retrospective one and all data were taken from the patients records and no new intervention was used in the surgical procedures; then there was no need to get inform consent from the patients.

10- ***Disclose conflicts of interest of the authors.***

Response: Its related sentence was added to the end of manuscript.

11- ***Please give details regarding post-intervention examinations.***

Response: Thank you for pointing this gap. All the required materials were added to the Methos section and highlighted in the manuscript.

12- ***The authors include a good number of references but may need to focus on some of them to give an in-depth discussion. You should have comprehensive and reliable comparisons between your findings with the other previous studies.***

Response: All the used references were discussed in compared in details in the discussion section which were highlighted in the manuscript.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 16 Jun 2023 – 20 Jun 2023

Referee 1 Reviewer

MAJOR REVISION 16 Jun 2023

1- The English in the manuscript has not been revised.
2- The manuscript needs correction for spelling and grammar (for example, line numbers 102, 126, 140, 155, 158, and 190).
3- The number of citations has fallen from 37 to 35. Two citations have been removed. Provide an explanation, please.
4- In addition, you should highlight all the changes.
5- Please use either PCNL or PNL as an abbreviation throughout the text. The abbreviation PNL is still present in the text.
6- For the reader's convenience, it is preferable to use a schematic diagram to depict the study and group divisions. This is quite obvious.
7- In the discussion section, you appear to have substituted adverbial phrases for an in-depth discussion.

Associate Editor

MAJOR REVISION 20 Jun 2023

Major Revision

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Dear Editorial Team of Nephro-Urology Monthly Journal

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to submit a revised draft of my manuscript titled " **Comparison of Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy Success Rate and Complications in Patients with a History of Different Therapeutic Interventions for Kidney Stone** " Nephro-Urology Monthly Journal. I appreciate the time and effort that you have dedicated to providing your valuable feedback on my manuscript. I replied to the comments in this file.

Responses to comments:

1- The English quality of the manuscript has not been revised.

Response: We thank you for pointing this comment out. The whole of manuscript was edited and rewrite academically by an English Ph.D.. We did not highlight the manuscript because the whole parts was rewritten.

2- The manuscript needs correction for spelling and grammar. (For example, line numbers 102, 126, 140, 155, 158, and 190).

Response: As I explained in response to the first question, all sections and lines were rewritten and edited.

3- The number of citations has fallen from 37 to 35. Two citations have been removed. Provide an explanation, please.

Response: in checking the references we noticed that two references were reaped and were given number two times that we deleted the first ones.

4- In addition, you should highlight all the changes.

Response: In the previous file that I made changes according to the reviewers comments, I highlighted all the changes that I made in the text. In this file all parts were rewritten and corrected by and English Ph.D. that no highlighted were made.

5- Please use either PCNL or PNL as an abbreviation throughout the text. The abbreviation PNL is still present in the text.

Response: Yes you are right. There were some parts that were not corrected in the previous file which I correct all of them completely.

6- For the reader's convenience, it is preferable to use a schematic diagram to depict the study and group divisions. This is quite obvious.

Response: A schematic diagram was used with its description in the proper place in the text.

7- In the discussion section, you appear to have substituted adverbial phrases for an in-depth discussion.

Response: All the discussion section were rewritten academically again by an English Language Ph.D.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 15 Jul 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 15 Jul 2023

Accept