

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Nephrology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRN_127411
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mirroring Mystery: Bilateral Spontaneous Perinephric Urinoma Unveiled</b>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add information on whether hydronephrosis or any distal obstruction was present initially. This information would help to clarify any underlying anatomical issues contributed to the development of the urinoma, and the decision making</li> <li>- Provide details regarding the conservative management, including the type of antibiotics, dosage and duration administered.</li> <li>- Include information on the duration and methods of follow-up, including post-treatment imaging if available. Follow-up is critical in evaluating the effectiveness of conservative management and ensuring the resolution of the urinoma. If post-treatment imaging (such as ultrasound or CT) was conducted, it should be mentioned.</li> <li>- Include information on the epidemiology and rarity of this condition in the discussion.</li> <li>- Expand on the discussion of differential diagnoses and alternative management strategies</li> <li>- Clarify the decision-making process in the therapeutic steps</li> </ul>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Clarissa Tania</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Pelita Harapan University, Indonesia</b>