

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR- 58396

Title: Surgical Management of Urolithiasis in Eight Dogs of Different Breeds,

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality			✓	
Clarity			✓	
Significance	✓			

Reviewer's ID: Bilqees Hamza

Detailed Reviewer's Report

The manuscript titled "Surgical Management of Urolithiasis in Eight Dogs of Different Breeds" details the clinical presentation, diagnosis, surgical treatment, and post-operative recovery of eight client-owned dogs diagnosed with bladder calculi. The study cohort, comprising four Shih Tzus, two Labrador Retrievers, one Golden Retriever, and one Pug, presented with classic lower urinary tract signs such as dysuria, hematuria, pollakiuria, and occasional urinary retention. Diagnostic confirmation was achieved using abdominal radiography, ultrasonography, and comprehensive hemato-biochemical and urinalysis profiling. Standard open laparocystotomy was performed on all animals to remove the uroliths, accompanied by thorough intraoperative flushing to minimize the risk of residual calculi. Post-operatively, all dogs recovered successfully, showing significant physiological and hemato-biochemical improvements by Day 30. While the study covers a clinically important and common condition in canine medicine, the manuscript requires several minor revisions to address missing data, resolve discrepancies in statistical reporting, clean up visual presentation artifacts, and standardize literature citations.

Detailed Discussion on the Suggestions for the Improvement of the Article

1. Addressing Missing Experimental Data in the Methodology

In the surgical procedure section (lines 88–89), the authors state that the recovered uroliths were washed, dried, and "submitted for mineral analysis when available". However, the results section contains no data, tables, or narrative discussing the mineral composition of these calculi (e.g., whether they were struvite, calcium oxalate, or urate). Because long-term prevention is heavily dependent on stone composition, the authors must clarify how many stones underwent analysis and explicitly state those findings in the

REVIEWER'S REPORT

results. If mineral analysis was ultimately not performed, the statement should be rephrased or removed, and this limitation should be discussed.

2. Resolving Contradictory Statistical and Narrative Values

There is an apparent typographical error in the results narrative regarding the liver enzyme values. On line 137, the authors report a significant reduction in AST activity, stating it decreased from "\$95.75 $\pm$ 5.07\$ to \$14.63 $\pm$ 0.92 U/L\$". However, in Table 3 (page 7), the pre-operative Day 0 mean AST value is listed as \$95.75 $\pm$ 5.07 U/L\$ while the reference range is listed as "13–15". A normal AST reference range for dogs is typically broader (often up to 45–50 U/L depending on the lab). The authors must check Table 3 to ensure both the reported mean values and the laboratory reference ranges are accurate and consistent with veterinary standards.

3. Correcting Duplicated Data Presentation and Formatting Artifacts

The manuscript currently duplicates the presentation of clinical signs. The distribution of symptoms is shown in both Table 2 (page 6) and Figure 1 (page 8). Presenting the exact same dataset in both a tabular and graphical format is redundant. The authors should choose one format—preferably Table 2 for precise data and statistical clarity—and remove the other. Furthermore, the manuscript contains a prominent transparent watermark reading "UNDER PEER REVIEW IN IJAR" spanning diagonally across several pages (pages 6, 8, 9, and 10). The authors must ensure that final submissions utilize clean, high-resolution figures (such as the radiographs in Figure 2) that are completely free of draft overlays or publisher watermarks.

4. Reconciling Bibliographic and In-Text Citations

There are minor discrepancies between the in-text citations and the final reference list. For example, "Lulich et al. (2013)" is cited in the introduction (line 37) but does not appear in the references. Conversely, the reference list contains "Lulich et al. (2009)" (lines 233–236) and "Sorenson and Ling (1993)" (lines 240–241), neither of which are cited anywhere within the main text. The authors must thoroughly audit their bibliography, remove uncited entries, and add the missing citations to ensure compliance with scholarly indexing standards.

Recommendation to the Editor

Accept with Minor Revisions

Comments to the Editor

The manuscript presents a highly practical, multi-breed clinical evaluation of surgical urolithiasis management in dogs, demonstrating excellent therapeutic success with open cystotomy. The clinical outcomes are solid, and the pre- and post-operative hemato-biochemical monitoring provides good objective evidence of systemic recovery.

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

However, the paper requires minor corrections before final publication. The authors must address the missing mineral analysis data, rectify the redundant data presentation (the duplicated Table 2 and Figure 1), correct the AST reference range discrepancy in Table 3, and resolve the mismatches in their reference list. These revisions are straightforward and will significantly polish the scientific presentation of this clinically useful study.