

## Review Form 1.7

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology</a>                                     |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_AJRRU_118973  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>MASSIVE BLADDER STONE IN A RURAL SECONDARY HEALTH FACILITY: CASE REPORT AND LITERATURE REVIEW</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>Case report</b>   |

### **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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b><br/>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b><br/>(If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p> | <p>Yes it is</p> <p>Yes it is</p> <p>The abstract is okay</p> <p>Subsections are okay</p> <p>Some references are too old<br/>Reference 11 was not cited properly and it was not in the text , and it is the most recent<br/>Author should cite it properly and made it apparent in the text</p> <p>The discussion was not well written<br/>The author should do more literature search on age and gender distribution, variance in clinical features, diagnosis, treatment and follow up<br/>The author should know that the gold standard diagnostic investigation for urolithiasis is<br/><b>NON CONTRAST HELICA CT</b></p> |   |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>   | <p>The manuscript needs English language editing</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Optional/General</b> comments.<br/>.stated above</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><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | Idowu Najeem Adedamola                            |
| Department, University & Country | Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Nigeria |