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Reviewer’s report:

* The results don’t seem to correspond to the query raised in the title
* Abstract fine
* Introduction is very long. Please reduce
* There are few interspersed English language corrections which need to be done
* Methodology:
  o Please write details of CT equipment (dual energy dual source 2x128 slice etc)
  o Were any of the phases acquired on dual energy mode? Why not? NCCT on DE could help in characterization of stone while nephrographic phase on DE could have obviated the need of NCCT
* The results are those what are anticipated and there is nothing new. Just detection of lesion is not sufficient. Its staging is also important. Thus, even though a lesion projecting into PCS may be well-seen on delayed phase as well, even then nephrographic phase is necessary for staging and assessment of local resectability
* Discussion is too long and one seems to lose track of the research question

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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