

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_79254
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute Kidney Injury after Ureteral Obstruction Due to Signet Ring Cell Adenocarcinoma of the Bladder
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>

Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The authors reported on a series of 10 patients with signet cell adenocarcinoma of the bladder (within one year). This is an astonishingly high number. They should give the figures of patients with "ordinary" adenocarcinoma and urothelial cancer treated during the same time period.</p> <p>Was there a difference in the number of patients with ureteral obstruction between signet cell adenocarcinoma and "ordinary" adenocarcinoma and urothelial cancer of the bladder?</p> <p>What does it mean: mainly male patients. The exact figures should be given.</p> <p>The clinical presentation was not reported. Was it really a sudden onset of symptoms as the term acute kidney injury suggests? Usually malignant ureteral obstruction is more chronic process.</p> <p>Was the histology only based on a cold cup biopsy as written in the Material and Methods section? This is insufficient as it does not allow for correct diagnosis especially with respect to staging.</p> <p>Nothing is reported on imaging like CT which is mandatory in patients with obstruction.</p> <p>The laboratory methods are not described at all.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Introduction "BC is more common in males than in females (1:2.44). It should be 2.44:1).</p> <p>Urethral ostium. It should be ureteral ostium</p>	
Optional/General comments	<p>The report is somewhat confusing. It should be a report on 10 patients (see Materials and Methods), in the Discussion section they wrote: "in the present case" (= a single patient) and "after removal of a calculus". That means that the reason for obstruction was not the signet cell adenocarcinoma but a stone.</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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Walter Ludwig Strohmaier
Department, University & Country	university of Würzburg, Germany