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General

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The authors must note in the abstract and the introduction that chemolysis of urinary stone disease has become a treatment of last resort because of the potential for serious harm to patients. There have been reported deaths and injury during these methods of therapy. Major textbooks on urolithiasis almost all begin with such admonitions. This is of course, what prompts these investigators into the evaluation of new methods of chemolysis formulas. But, one must be clinically cautious as they mention in their discussion.

2. Introduction sentence 4 is vague and incoherent. What are they trying to say, there must be a better way of saying this... "All of the technologic advancements in the methods of urologic stone treatment have decreased the residual fragments and morbidity to patients." ???

3. Introduction, 5th sentence. This sentence is invalid. It must be removed from the paper, or if they find it necessary, where is the data that they are using to make this assertion. I've seen several papers suggesting what they are stating but there is in fact, no proof that this is so.

4. Second paragraph of introduction. Must add some indication of why dissolution through chemolysis has fallen into a limited role. There have been deaths secondary to magnesium toxicity and septic shock.


6. I believe this article and experiment are well conceived, well written and of usefull scientific interest. I definitely would like to see phase I and phase II clinical efficacy trials.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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