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Reviewer's report:

The authors present an interesting study aiming to evaluate the efficacy of unilateral pedal lymphangiography in conjunction with CT angiography. The number of patients is high considering the rarity of the condition. The approach seems to be efficient in detecting and guiding the surgery. Nevertheless, some issues were raised while studying the manuscript.

When the authors are referring to the method of cystoscopy they should refer to "cystoscopy" and not "cystoscope". Please correct the term in the text and abstract.

Although I am not native English speaking myself, the authors should consider revising the manuscript with the aid of a native English speaking person. There are numerous expression errors.

Patients and methods

Patients:

What was the nature of the current study? Retrospective or prospective? If the study is prospective, did the authors consider to do sample size calculation? Would it be possible with the available evidence in the literature?

The authors should be clear in the evaluation that was done and concluded to the final diagnosis of "idiopathic" chyluria. In example, were any tumors excluded?

The performance of "renal pelvic instillation" should be explained.

Sclerotherapy as a treatment option would be more accurate to be supported by an appropriate publication.

It is important to present the population as accurately as possible since the decision of clinician to follow the suggestions of the authors is based on the ability to select the appropriate patients.

It is not clear why endoscopy of the upper tract did not take place. In the time of endourology, a flexible renoureteroscopy could provide information on the side of the chyluria and exclude
conditions such as tumors. Especially in the case of patients with hematuria were included in the study.

Lymphangiography technique:

Were the patients sedated for the performance of the approach?

Follow-up treatment:

What approach was selected to do the renal lymphatic stripping and ligation? Laparoscopy? Did the surgeons prepare the kidney? Please be more specific.

Results:

Please provide in table 1 the statistical test that was used.

Table 2 is not accurate since the presence of "+" or a number of "+" is not supported by the current investigation. The authors could be more descriptive in the table in order to provide the appropriate information to the reader. Reference to the literature could also be useful. Otherwise, the table is more or less not accurate.

Discussion:

"Actually, the radiation exposure was more in LPG + CTA than LPG alone (Table 2)." Did the authors measure the radiation exposure? Table 2 does not provide any specific information. Please rephrase.

Conclusion:

The conclusion should provide a summary of the findings of the study. The current conclusion states that presented approach could replace LPG. My impression is that the authors provided an interesting approach which seems to be effective (and more effective than the common approaches) in detecting the sites of the lymphatics that may be related to chyluria. More extensive research would provide the evidence for the establishment of the approach.

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.

Yes

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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