



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_53586
Title of the Manuscript:	The efficacy and safety of Simultaneous use of Wire stone Basket and Pneumatic lithotripter Probe in the Treatment of ureteral Stones: randomized control trial
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The strengths and weaknesses of the study are not described.</p> <p>Bibliographic references must follow some guide, you cannot define which rule was applied: Vancouver, APA, etc.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>There is no clarity of the patients' recruitment time, they only refer to the year 2017. As described, it seems a case-control study, but they do not specify how they calculated the sample size to define which significant clinical difference to consider. If it really is a prospective study, then the design is a quasi-randomized controlled clinical trial (they do not specify how randomisation was done).</p> <p>The results should be described and not interpreted. In the discussion they begin by telling what they usually do in the center; It is recommended the discussion started with the main and significant findings of the study. The discussion reports many data already described in the results. Several articles with similar objectives are described, but they are not contrasted with the study.</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>It is an interesting study by the subject and considering it is focused on the utility for the patients.</p> <p>Yes. The authors mention this technique with wire basket they are using it 8 years ago and consider it has the advantage of reducing the procedure time.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>There is no mention of approval of the protocol by an ethics committee. It is not described if the informed consent was written or verbal.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jorge Antonio Coronado Daza
Department, University & Country	Universidad de Cartagena, Colombia