

[Review Form3](#)

Book Name:	<a href="#">Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_4034
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A PROSPECTIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY ON IRRIGATION FLUID ABSORPTION, CHANGES IN BLOOD CELL INDICES, ELECTROLYTE AND VITAL PARAMETERS OF PATIENTS UNDERGOING PERCUTANEOUS NEPHROLITHOTOMY</b>
Type of the Article	Book chapter

**PART 1: Comments**

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript "A Prospective Observational Study on Irrigation Fluid Absorption, Changes in Blood Cell Indices, Electrolyte and Vital Parameters of Patients Undergoing Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy" presents an important observational study in the field of urology, focusing on the effects of irrigation fluid absorption during PCNL. The study addresses a pertinent clinical question with well-executed methodology, making it suitable for publication after significant revision.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is detailed but contains grammatical errors and lacks clarity in presenting the primary findings succinctly. Consider rephrasing and condensing the abstract to focus on key outcomes and significance.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript provides comprehensive data on changes in hemodynamic parameters, electrolytes, and blood indices, correlating them with the volume of irrigation fluid used, which is clinically insightful.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes	

[Review Form3](#)

<p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, but needs to be revised regarding linguistic aspects by an expert in English.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>The manuscript "A Prospective Observational Study on Irrigation Fluid Absorption, Changes in Blood Cell Indices, Electrolyte and Vital Parameters of Patients Undergoing Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy" presents an important observational study in the field of urology, focusing on the effects of irrigation fluid absorption during PCNL. The study addresses a pertinent clinical question with well-executed methodology, making it suitable for publication after significant revision.</p> <p>The strength of the manuscript is summarized below:</p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Relevance of Topic:</b> The manuscript addresses a critical issue related to PCNL, a widely performed procedure for managing renal stones. The study is particularly relevant due to the growing prevalence of nephrolithiasis and the challenges associated with fluid absorption during surgery.</li> <li><b>Methodology:</b> The prospective design with a well-defined inclusion and exclusion criterion strengthens the validity of the findings.</li> <li><b>Statistical Analysis:</b> Use of t-tests and Pearson's correlation is appropriate for evaluating pre- and post-operative changes in clinical parameters.</li> <li><b>Results and Discussion:</b> The manuscript provides comprehensive data on changes in hemodynamic parameters, electrolytes, and blood indices, correlating them with the volume of irrigation fluid used, which is clinically insightful.</li> <li><b>Ethics and Consents:</b> Ethical clearance and patient consent were appropriately obtained, ensuring adherence to research protocols.</li> </ol> <p>In the following, I would like to mention some weaknesses and suggestions to improve the quality of the article:</p> <p><b>Weaknesses and Suggestions</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Language and Grammar:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript requires significant proofreading to correct grammatical errors and improve readability. For example, phrases like "there were very less established studies" and "there was no association between the post of hemodynamics" need refinement.</li> <li>Consistent formatting for terms like "TEMP," "TDS," and "IRF" is recommended.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Clarity of Results:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The results section could be structured better. Data presentation (e.g., mean changes, ranges) should be tabulated for clarity.</li> <li>Statistical significance (e.g., p-values) should be emphasized for easier interpretation.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Discussion Depth:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The discussion section largely repeats the results. It should focus more on the clinical implications of findings, comparisons with other studies, and recommendations for practice.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Limitations:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The limitations section acknowledges the lack of post-operative follow-up and parameters like ethanol testing. However, it could further elaborate on the potential impact of these limitations on the study's conclusions.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Future Directions:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The manuscript suggests future studies but does not specify the methodology or focus areas clearly. Including concrete suggestions for further research would strengthen the manuscript.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

[Review Form3](#)

	<p><b>6. Figures and Tables:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Inclusion of charts or graphs to visualize trends (e.g., changes in electrolytes and blood indices) would make the manuscript more engaging and informative.</li> </ul> <p><b>7. Abstract:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The abstract is detailed but contains grammatical errors and lacks clarity in presenting the primary findings succinctly. Consider rephrasing and condensing the abstract to focus on key outcomes and significance.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the study addresses a pertinent clinical question with well-executed methodology, making it suitable for publication after significant revision. However, revisions are needed, focusing on language, organization, and clarity. Furthermore, Enhanced visual data representation (tables and graphs) is recommended to support the findings.</p>	
--	---	--

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Hossein Salehi Omran</b>
<b>Department, University &amp; Country</b>	<b>Medical College of Wisconsin, United States</b>