

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_102981
Title of the Manuscript:	CLINICOPATHOLOGIC PROGNOSTIC FACTORS IN NMIBC FOR RECURRENCE & PROGRESSION
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Identifying factors contributing for recurrence of non-muscle invasive bladder cancer is a very important research gap, which was addressed in this manuscript.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The authors have to responds for the points mentioned below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Many scientific terms need to be properly abbreviated when first mentioned in the manuscript (Ex: Hb, NLR, PLR) 2) Methodology needs to be elaborated with the sample size calculations, final sample size after exclusions 3) Ethical clearance should be mentioned, If not required also need to be mentioned with justification. 4) Study design was mentioned as retrospective for a period of 2012-2016 and follow up was mentioned till 2017. How a study including follow up is termed as retrospective study. Explain the study design appropriately. 5) All tables should have proper table legends to explain/expand terms in the table 6) In Table 5, units for the quantitative terms were not clearly mentioned. 7) Results need to elaborated 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	D. Sujatha
Department, University & Country	Institute of Pharmaceutical Technology, Sri Padmavati Mahila Visvavidyalayam, India