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Reviewer’s report:

The authors provide a great overview on discrepancies and coincidences in current guidelines on active stone removal.

My comments, suggestion and questions:

Methods: in my count there are 61 nations (not 63) represented by one or more delegates at SIU and there are members of 131 countries. You might have missed some national GL:


Guideline language is usually restricted to the nation's main language making it difficult to address. You might consider to mention these limitations in your methods or discussion.

Great Britain / England: I miss some discussion about GL there. NICE had an older guideline (probably not older than the French GL) on renal and ureteric colic, kidney conditions and renal stones. Now there is something published on laparoscopic stone removal 2007 (https://www.nice.org.uk/Guidance/IPG212) (and new GLs are supposed to be published Febr 20, 2019)


Page 7, line 149: AUA is a national GL as well, not a true international one

Page 8, lines 181ff: EAU-GL calls PCNL for upper ureteral stones as „antegrade URS“, which is recommended as 1st choice among others for the treatment of large ureteric stones (see Fig. 4.3.2 of current EAU-Guideline). Considering this, your calculation of consensus and the discussion might need to be re-addressed.

Page 11, lines 241ff: a comment you might consider: to my knowledge in US SWL is performed using X-ray localisation systems only (no ultrasound); this might influence the recommendations of AUA. (Besides, this might reflect the „national bias“ of AUA and other national Guidelines)
Page 12, line 260: ".....delegating the choice of the appropriate treatment to the urologist." Would suggest to add "...and patient's preference"

Fig 1 and text body of manuscript: open surgery and laparoscopic stone removal is mentioned / recommended in other GLs as well, e.g. in text body and 2 recommendation boxes of EAU-GL, or in the AUA-GL on staghorn stones (mentioned above).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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