

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRRU_102578 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Ex-Vivo Management of Renal Calculi in Living Donor Kidneys: A Retrospective study from Malaysia |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajrru.com/index.php/AJRRU/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Acceptable</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | Suitable | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>1. To use the term End-stage Kidney Disease (ESKD) instead of ESRD according to the updated nomenclature guidelines.</p> <p>2. In the objective section, the number of cases in this series is only 4 (3 of them were Randal plaques), and the follow-up data at one year, thus it would be better to remove the last phrases: "To highlight the potential benefits of ex-vivo surgery in expanding the pool of suitable organs for transplantation and to generate insights that can contribute to the ongoing discussion on the optimal operative management of graft urolithiasis. The long-term impact on graft function and outcomes will also be explored".</p> <p>3. I would suggest adding and reviewing the following reference: Longo N, Calogero A, Creta M, Celentano G, Napolitano L, Capece M, La Rocca R, Sagnelli C, Carlomagno N, Peluso G, Pagano T, Campanile S, Dodaro CA, Sica A, Califano G, Crocetto F, Fusco F, Mangiapia F, Santangelo M. Outcomes of Renal Stone Surgery Performed Either as Predonation or Ex Vivo Bench Procedure in Renal Grafts from Living Donors: A Systematic Review. Biomed Res Int. 2020 Nov 27;2020:6625882. doi: 10.1155/2020/6625882. PMID: 33335926; PMCID: PMC7723480.</p> | |

PART 2:

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Ala Ali |
| Department, University & Country | Nephrology and Renal Transplantation Centre, Iraq |