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Reviewer's report:

This article demonstrated the prognostic impact of CRP in upper urinary tract urothelial carcinoma (UUT-UC) patients treated surgically. As a reference of Saito et al, the prognostic impact of CRP has been shown. Furthermore, the significance of CRP as a useful biomarker for UUT-UC has been described in a review (Nat Rev Urol. 2011;8:659). Therefore, I think this is a confirmatory study about the significance of CRP in UUT-UC patients. I have several comments.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) In the patients section, authors shown that this study included 158 patients. However, 115 patients whose preoperative CRP values were available appeared to be evaluated in this study. How many patients were eligible in this study? Please specify.

2) In the results section, author described that the current population constituted from 113 men and 45 women (total 158 patients). Again, I think that 115 patients whose preoperative CRP values were available were objective of this study. Patients’ demographics should be changed.

3) Why the population of ureter cancer was so small (total 7 patients)? The cancer specific survival rate of this cohort (the 5yr-rate of approximately 50%) would be worse compared to those of previous studies (around 70%). The follow up period were quite short (median of 16 months) for this type of analysis. Therefore this cohort appeared to be very biased one. The explanation is needed.

4) The inclusion and exclusion criteria (e.g. the prior or concomitant bladder cancer, peri-operative chemotherapy) have not been sufficiently documented. That information could be added on the analysis.

5) The limitations of this study are the relative small number of patients, the short follow-up (median 16 months), the biased cohort, and retrospective nature of the study. The limitations section of this paper does not adequately discuss these points.

Minor Essential Revisions

6) In the patients section, Furman grading is a nuclear grading classification system for clear cell renal cell carcinoma.
7) Authors added the statistical methods after each p value in tumor specific parameters paragraph. These statistical methods should be specified in the material and methods section.
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