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**Reviewer's report:**

**General**
The article raises an important practical daily question. The major flaw of the article is the retrospective methodology. Why was the patient sent to IVU and not to another modality? Does this decision influence the final outcome. The authors are aware of this flaw.

**Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)**

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

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

Since 80% of the stones are smaller than 10mm in the study, I would change the name of the article to "Is excretory urogram mandatory in patients with small to medium.." Mentioning the 20mm in the heading is misleading.

**Advice on publication:** Accept after minor compulsory revisions

**Level of interest:** A paper of considerable merit and interest in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable
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