

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_97784
Title of the Manuscript:	Ureteric transection with jejunal injury secondary to bicycle handle bar penetrating injury.
Type of the Article	Case report

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> <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>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>We fully appreciate the effort made by colleagues to accomplish this report. The topic itself is of great importance. Having professed my general enthusiasm for the topic and its importance, I have some concerns that I feel are tractable but require substantive effort. Our ambition is for the research formula to be in keeping with the pure scientific method, so we wanted to include a set of notes that we see as necessary to prepare the manuscript in a more sedate way that achieves the purpose of academic publishing.</p> <p>My comments here are concerned solely with the re organization of the manuscript. Consideration of these points will, I believe, lead to an improved report that better illustrates the key concepts and conclusions.</p> <p>If the authors are able to clarify the few limitations, add a helpful conceptual model, and revise the report to clarify the interpretation and application of this manuscript for the journal audience, this should make a nice addition to the literature.</p> <p>I recommend the manuscript for publication after some adjustments have been taken into account.</p> <p>Please pay attention, review the attached comments (yellow colored icons in the main text), and rewrite the article accordingly as possible.</p>	
<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:	Mohammed Joudi Aboud
Department, University & Country	The Maternity and Child Teaching Hospital, Iraq