

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_101409
Title of the Manuscript:	TESTICULAR SELF-EXAMINATION AND TESTICULAR CANCER: AN ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE AND PRACTICE AMONG NIGERIAN MALE NON-HEALTH UNDERGRADUATES.
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes. It brings a very valid and always current theme. However, as described in the article itself, it needs major adaptations to become publishable. 2. No. As it is, it is not clear to the reader. 3. Yes. However, it needs adjustments. 4. The subsections are adequate, but the structuring of the text is not. It needs profound modifications. 5. Apparently yes. However, it needs major adaptations in methodology, presentation of results and discussions, as well as structuring the conclusion. 6. No. References are old and scarce. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Although comprehensive, the text needs grammatical adequacy. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>All comments are in the text.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ellen Cordeiro Bento Da Silva
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Rural De Pernambuco, Brazil