

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Cancer and Tumor International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_125262
Title of the Manuscript:	CONGENITAL MESOBLASTIC NEPHROMA : A CASE REPORT
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.	First, I would like to state that, I have no conflict of interest in reviewing this paper. CMN is a rare tumor in neonates, generally presenting with an excellent prognosis. However, it should be carefully diagnosed with the exclusion of Wilms tumor. Regarding this, the case have a unique presentation. On the other hand, the take home message or the impact which is desired to made on literature is not clearly pointed out.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	<b>Congenital Mesoblastic Nephroma in a Preterm Neonate: Case and Complications</b> I suggest the authors to point out the complications and poor outcome of the patient in the heading.	
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.	I believe abstract section is clear and comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure is appropriate, I think.	
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.	Manuscript is technically and scientifically robust. However, asmentioned before, the take home message for the readers should be more clear. In this regard, may be the importance of surgical team or the timing of surgery or whatever authors believe important to demonstrate the audience should be underlined.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references are sufficient and uptodate. No suggestions on this.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	The usage of English language and accuracy is suitable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The conclusion section and take home messages should be clarified.	

#### 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Sefika Akyol</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Health Sciences University, Turkey</b>