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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have posed a very important and reasonable question as noted in their title. They compared 3 groups, those with IVU, UHCT, and ultrasound plus KUB. They found no difference in the need for auxiliary procedures and complications of the 3 groups. Thus, they felt that IVU was not a requirement of treatment stones of ESWL.

The authors note only in the Methods that more complicated patients were excluded from the study. They do note in the last sentence of the discussion that they were selected patients. I would suggest that this aspect of selection should be stressed to indicate that patients with possible abnormalities should be defined with IVU.

I would consider this paper of considerable merit and interest among urologists who treat stones.

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)

*There are minor inaccuracies in English with a routine editorial process

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

What next?: Accept after minor compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of considerable merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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