

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_103902
Title of the Manuscript:	“Primary Mucinous Adenocarcinoma of Renal Pelvis- A diagnostic dilemma”
Type of the 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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes Yes Yes Yes Add following references Xu X, Shen W, Wang D, Li N, Huang Z, Sheng J, Rucker AJ, Mao W, Xu H, Cheng G. Clinical features and prognosis of resectable pulmonary primary invasive mucinous adenocarcinoma. Translational Lung Cancer Research. 2022 Mar;11(3):420. Zeng H, Zhang M, Xie Y, Wang M, Dai J, Zhu X, Zeng Y, Xu N, Huang P, Zhao J, Sun G. Primary renal mucinous adenocarcinoma masquerading as a giant renal cyst: a case report. Frontiers in Oncology. 2023 May 8;13:1129680.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Check and review the grammar	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Bigyan Ranjan Jali
Department, University & Country	VSSUT, India