

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_127411
Title of the Manuscript:	Mirroring Mystery: Bilateral Spontaneous Perinephric Urinoma Unveiled
Type of the Article	Case report

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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 a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This paper can be considered as an article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests (nephrology, urology). Bilateral fluid collection in paranephritic or perinephritic spaces are very rare, with no presented data so far in literature in cases without clear pathophysiology. Minimally invasive and expectative approach is preferable and the results are positive making the publication valuable to its reader.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is well formed with sufficient information on case presented within the article.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The Abstract is representative of the case presented with all needed content in its clear and scientifically correct order.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The relevant patient information, including: General information Main symptoms of the patient, medical history and the relevant physical examination findings are presented in proper and correct order. Diagnostic assessments, including: Diagnostic methods Challenges, lack of literature and rarity of case presented are noted The article provides all the needed information mentioned with its fine order and clear presentation aim. Interpretation (discussion and conclusion) are well balanced and supported by the case presented	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Two main goals of the manuscript are achieved. First, presented pathology is very rare, actually extremely rare with no literature presented. The other goal is treatment with expectative attitude and minimally invasive approach in diagnostics. Scientific "weight" is sufficient with comment on further follow-up of patient and presentation of results. Cross-diagnostics including imaging and fluid identification through percutaneous aspiration are fulfilling technical demands on patient oriented approach.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Literature review and references are well cited and with enough recent papers mentioned.	
Minor REVISION comments	No need for correcting language since it is well structured text with proper scholar communication level.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Bojan Vuckovic
Department, University & Country	University of Nis, Serbia