

Review of: "Prestenting and its role in the URS: a study on the advantages it could have in intracorporeal lithotripsy interventions"

Ercan Ogreden

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Dear Editor;

The article is well designed, the title and abstract sections are suitable for content. The introduction part was evaluated in the light of scientific data and the purpose was emphasized. The method part and the results were discussed, but the deficiencies that I mentioned below were determined. Please let's make these corrections and the most important part, the discussion part, is missing. I would like to read it again after these deficiencies are completed.

Title and abstract

1. The title is compatible with the working content. The aim of the study, findings and results are given in the abstract.
2. Key words are not given after the abstract. At least 3 keywords should be given.

Introduction (ureterolithotripsy; retrograde intrarenal surgery;preoperative standing vs...)

1. Scientific studies were evaluated and the aim of the study and the contribution of its results to science were stated.

Methods

1. Study design: The study design was given in the method section, and the characteristics of the groups were determined.
2. Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection.
3. The start and end dates of the study and the characterization of the groups were designed in accordance with the purpose.
4. This study is a retrospective, case-controlled, observational study.
5. Statistical methods: All statistical methods were defined for the comparison of the groups.
6. Ethical approval that it was obtained from the relevant institution was not given in the study.

Results

1. The word "significant" should be corrected in English as "significantly" throughout the article, please.
2. The results were discussed between both groups and statistical significance ratios were stated.
3. The results were discussed between both groups and statistical significance ratios were stated. But the data is not specified in the tables. Tables should be given at the relevant points in the conclusion

section.

Discussion

1. Tartışma bölümü çalışmaya dahil edilmemiştir.

Conclusion

1. In the conclusion section, the positive and negative aspects of the data obtained were emphasized and suggestions were made.

Reference

1. References should be given numerically in the relevant discussion section.