

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_120347
Title of the Manuscript:	Renal Metachronous Metastasis from Adenocarcinoma of the Rectum: A Case Report and Review of literature
Type of the Article	Case report

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This type of cases are rare and its knowledge is important for diagnosis and beneficial for treatment of patient so it is important to report for scientific community. Manuscript is very well written. All parts are covered very well.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes Title is suitable	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	perfect	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Section : Presentation of case : size of tumour in imaging study was not mentioned . extension of lower pole mass into PCS or up to renal sinus fat is not mentioned anywhere. Decision of nephrectomy was based on which imaging findings ? if mass was small then why not partial nephrectomy ? justification regarding this is required. Figure 1 : last sentence of caption is wrongly typed Table 1 : as this manuscript is regarding only metastasis from rectal cancer then why cases of ascending and descending colon metastasis is enumerated ? it unnecessarily lengthens discussion part and table length. It is not required at all.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. :	Too much references are there. Not required at all. On my side reference number 3 rd and 4 th are not required. Reference number 17 is unrelevant as contrast enhanced USG is not related to this manuscript. Reference number 18, 19 and 20 are more or same regarding imaging concerns out of them any one is sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes Some spelling mistakes are there. Please read carefully and correct it.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Kajal Patel
Department, University & Country	Ikdrclts, India