

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_89999
Title of the Manuscript:	The number of patients with chronic illnesses who underwent operative urological interventions for Urolithiasis in KFHU from 2019 to 2021
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journalajrru.com/index.php/AJRRU/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	An attempt is made in the manuscript to determine the incidence of urolithiasis associated with chronic diseases and identify risk factors for these patients In the case of this manuscript, it is unfortunate that it does not meet the requirement for an original article. This title is unclear, and it is not in agreement with the content of the manuscript. There is too much simplicity in the material and method. It should not have bullet points and, should be written in a narrative form, like a story. Too many bracketed numbers make it difficult to follow the results and discussion. There is too much information in the Conclusions, which needs to be simplified. The references are few and most are in the Introduction section, that makes the discussion without a substantial impact. Obviously, the article template isn't the same for every manuscript, such as the spacing between rows or justify. In addition, it is recommended that the manuscript be revised in an academic English style. In this form, unfortunately, the manuscript cannot be accepted for publication for the reasons mentioned above. Prior to publication, they need to be revised extensively.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Bulai Catalin Andrei
Department, University & Country	"Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania