

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_110631
Title of the Manuscript:	Early experience with transurethral endoscopic de-roofing of single system orthotopic ureterocele in adults
Type of the Article	Original article

**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)
<p><b>Compulsory REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This is an article that can answer the question of when and how adult ureterocele patients should be treated.</p> <p>2. The title should be simple and descriptive. The title could be 'Experience with endoscopic treatment in patients with acquired ureterocele'.</p> <p>3. There is insufficient information about treatment success in the abstract of the article.</p> <p>4. The subsections and structure of manuscript are not enough because of statistical section.</p> <p>5. I think, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. It would be more appropriate to update some sources (especially 9,10 and 12).</p>	
<p><b>Minor REVISION</b> comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language quality of the article is suitable for scholar communications.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>1. A little more information about the purpose of the study could have been given in the introduction.</p> <p>2. More information about 'the Brueziere classification' mentioned in the conclusion.</p> <p>3. In the Discussion section, the duration of follow-up treatment was determined according to what and why ultrasound was considered as such in control patients when it is not reliable.</p>	

**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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

## Review Form 1.7

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Hasan Gungor</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gaziantep City Hospital, Turkey</b>