### PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Nephrology  

**Manuscript NO:** 80194  

**Title:** Acute Kidney Injury Due to Bilateral Malignant Ureteral Obstruction: Is there an Optimal Mode of Drainage?  

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed  

**Peer-review model:** Single blind  

**Reviewer’s code:** 0354647  

**Position:** Peer Reviewer  

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD  

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor, Surgeon  

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** Italy  

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Egypt  

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-09-19  

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique  

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-09-20 18:27  

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-09-20 19:24  

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
<th>[ Y] Grade D: Fair</th>
<th>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language quality</td>
<td>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing</td>
<td>[ Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Rejection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (High priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Accept (General priority)</td>
<td>[ ] Minor revision</td>
<td>[ Y] Major revision</td>
<td>[ ] Rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-review</td>
<td>[ Y] Yes</td>
<td>[ ] No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The narrative review proposed by Gadelkareem et al is potentially interesting, focusing on a relevant topic. However, it lacks of supporting data and gives the feeling of a text book chapter for medical students. I would strongly suggest to include proper citations with larger amount of data and some comparative tables summarizing pros and cons of PCN vs JJ stenting. Also, I find some lexical choices rather questionable for a scientific journal.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this review article, the authors discuss treatment options for obstructive uropathy related to malignancy which is an important topic. Over all article is written well. I would recommend abbreviating and streamlining the manuscript with more focus on available treatment modalities. It will be good to provide a table comparing the pros and cons of nephrostomy vs ureteral stent.