

## Reviewer Assessment

Frank-Mattias Schäfer\* and Maximilian Stehr

# Tissue engineering in pediatric urology – a critical appraisal

<https://doi.org/10.1515/iss-2018-0011>

Received March 7, 2018; accepted April 17, 2018

**\*Corresponding author: Dr. med. Frank-Mattias Schäfer**, Department of Pediatric Surgery and Pediatric Urology, Cnopfsche Kinderklinik, St. Johannis-Mühlgasse 19, 90419 Nürnberg, Germany, E-mail: [mattias.schaefer@diakonieneuendettelsau.de](mailto:mattias.schaefer@diakonieneuendettelsau.de)

## Reviewers' Comments to Original Submission

### Reviewer 1: anonymous

Mar 12, 2018

<b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b>	Accept with Minor Revision
<b>Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:</b>	70
<b>Custom Review Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	5 - High/Yes
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	4
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	1 - Low/No
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	2
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	2
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	4
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

**Comments to Authors:**

The paper is a state of the review dealing with tissue engineering for urological diseases. The authors provide a detailed review of the current literature and discuss the pros and cons of historical and current approaches. In addition, they discuss potential strategies to overcome problems associated with bladder and urethra reconstruction that apparently hinders successful translation into humans. The authors provide a comprehensive review. Nevertheless, the article requires revision regarding grammar and structure. Additionally, there are some citations missing, which need to be inserted.

---

**Reviewer 2: Stuart Hosie**

Mar 29, 2018

<b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b>	Accept
<b>Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:</b>	90
<b>Custom Review Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	5 - High/Yes
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	5 - High/Yes
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	5 - High/Yes
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	5 - High/Yes
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	5 - High/Yes
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	5 - High/Yes
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	5 - High/Yes
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	4
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

**Comments to Authors:**

Nice review, relevant Topic, good overview regarding past, present and prospects of tissue Engineering in pediatric urology.

---

**Authors' Response to Reviewer Comments**

Apr 12, 2018

We thank the reviewers for their kind comments and provide a thoroughly revised version.

Detailed answer to the reviewer's concerns:

**Reviewer #1**

The authors provide a comprehensive review. Nevertheless, the article requires revision regarding grammar and structure. Additionally, there are some citations missing, which need to be inserted.

Answer: The paper has been thoroughly checked for spelling and grammatical errors by a native speaker. In some cases sentences have been shortened to ease reading. We have also included some missing citations as requested by the reviewer, bringing the total number of citations to 115 (+6).

We hope that the revision will meet the requirements for final publication.

## Reviewers' Comments to Revision

### Reviewer 1: anonymous

Apr 13, 2018

---

<b>Reviewer Recommendation Term:</b>	Accept
<b>Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating:</b>	70
<b>Custom Review Questions</b>	<b>Response</b>
Is the subject area appropriate for you?	3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper's content?	4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly?	4
Are the results/conclusions justified?	4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented?	4
How adequate is the data presentation?	4
Are units and terminology used correctly?	4
Is the number of cases adequate?	N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate?	N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content?	4
Does the reader get new insights from the article?	4
Please rate the practical significance.	4
Please rate the accuracy of methods.	N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control.	N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables.	4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references.	4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language.	4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript.	3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript?	Yes

#### Comments to Authors:

Paper has improved by modification, which have been carried out.

---