

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_77604
Title of the Manuscript:	Vesicoureteral reflux in the transplanted kidney – risk and prognostic factors: A single-center experience.
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:

<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Please, add a control group without vesicoureteral reflux.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The experience is very interesting. The introduction section is clear and gives all relevant information to introduce the manuscript's aim.</p> <p>Methods: The patients included in this case-series are those older than 18 years old and waiting for second kidney transplantation and, at the same time, have vesicoureteral reflux (VUR) of the previous transplant in the preoperative evaluation. Regrettably, there is no control group precluding the understanding if VUR is or not a handicap to graft survival.</p> <p>Results: They are clearly shown. It is stated that the surgical technique was the same in all patients, clarifying that this issue did not take part of the former grafts evolution.</p> <p>As there is no control group without VUR, it is not possible to evaluate if the short mean graft survival of the studied sample (6 years) can be explained by the reflux itself.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is assuring that other variables potentially related to the survival of kidneys suffering of VUR, such as VUR grade or the presence of bacteriuria/infection seem to be not related to graft survival, although the 26 patients can be insufficient to answer that question.</p> <p>The discussion section is well written and comments all findings shown in the Results section.</p> <p>References and abstract are both OK.</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(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)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Fernando González Fuenzalida</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Universidad De Chile, Chile</b>