Re: Bozkurt Y, Soylemez H, Atar M, Sancaktutar AA, Penbegul N, Hatipoglu NK, et al. Effectiveness and safety of ureteroscopy in pregnant women: a comparative study. Urolithiasis 2013; 41:37–42

Neeraj Kumar Goyal · Apul Goel

Received: 25 March 2013 / Accepted: 10 April 2013 / Published online: 21 April 2013
© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

We read this article with great interest and appreciate the authors for this study; however, few points need further clarification. Although patients with any obstetric complication were excluded from the current study, however, it may be interesting to know what was done for this subgroup of patients, as options are really limited in such situations. The ultrasound (USG) was diagnostic for ureteral calculi in 51 % patients only, whereas there was no preoperative localization of stones in rest of patients. It will be important to know the stone location in this group of

patients. It will guide us regarding the sensitivity of USG in different stone locations and be helpful to know that USG is good for which part of ureter. Lastly authors have not mentioned the cause of persistent or increasing hydronephrosis in five pregnant women with negative ureteroscopy. This may particularly be useful to know as the differential diagnoses of renal colic in pregnant women.

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

N. K. Goyal · A. Goel (✉)
Department of Urology, King George's Medical University,
Lucknow 226003, India
e-mail: goelapul1@rediffmail.com