

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRS_90664
Title of the Manuscript:	Urinary tract endometriosis: Surgical perspective
Type of the Article	Case report

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajcrs.com/index.php/AJCRS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Author(s) would extend background at least with basic introduction relevant to disease and findings of the case would must be given.</p> <p>Time length of the various historical perspective should be given. For example, she had undergone caesarean section xx years and yy months ago. Patient observing these symptoms for xx years etc. History of normal mensural cycle xx years and son.</p> <p>Author(s) mentioned that clinical laboratory parameters were normal, author(s) should include tabulated results of main parameters.</p> <p>Authors would optimize figure legends. For instance, operative findings is not very much suitable in this case, I would suggest it would be appropriate to use intraoperative view of lesion or likely legend for figure 3. I would suggest to combine all figures in one to reduce the space and improve easy understanding of readers.</p> <p>Authors would include more histological examination views from various dimensions such as periphery and centre. It will provide more information on histological characteristics with respect to space.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Already mentioned above.	
Optional/General comments	Already mentioned above.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Imran Khan
Department, University & Country	University of Science and Technology of China, China