

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_125732
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy – A rare paraneoplastic syndrome of renal cell carcinoma</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The manuscript highlights the importance of the evaluation of the paraneoplastic etiology in patients with neurological deficits. There are not many cases reported about RCC and CIDP association.</li> <li>2. The authors encourage clinicians to consider RCC in patients with unexplained neurological deficit</li> <li>3. If possible provide more details on the patient's treatment and follow-up</li> <li>4. Discuss the potential mechanisms underlying the RCC-CIDP association.</li> </ol>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title seems suitable <b>Suggestion</b> Paraneoplastic Chronic Inflammatory Demyelinating Polyradiculoneuropathy (CIDP) Associated with Renal Cell Carcinoma (RCC): A Rare but Critical Diagnosis	
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 conclusion needs reframing: "In patients presenting with neurological deficit, paraneoplastic etiology need to be considered as the potential cause of Chronic inflammatory demyelinating polyradiculoneuropathy"	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Case Reports should follow the structure of Abstract, Introduction, Presentation of Case, Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgements, Competing Interests, Authors' Contributions, Consent (where applicable), Ethical approval (where applicable), and References plus figures and/or tables.  In the discussion of the article the conclusion seems to be too long . this can be reframed	
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.	There is clear and concise presentation of a rare clinical case, supported by diagnostic evidence of nerve conduction studies, nerve biopsy, and imaging.  <b>Suggestion:</b> to provide more details on the patient's treatment and follow-up and discuss the potential mechanisms underlying the RCC-CIDP association	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	No the references do not seem to be sufficient. Please add few more recent references.  <a href="https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neurology/articles/10.3389/fneur.2024.1456835/full">https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/neurology/articles/10.3389/fneur.2024.1456835/full</a>  <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29194677/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29194677/</a>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes the English quality appears to be suitable	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Please mention the abbreviations in brackets next to the words when used for the first time.	

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Aditya Jalan</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>B P Koirala Memorial Cancer Hospital, Nepal</b>