

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_124135
Title of the Manuscript:	A self-inserted foreign body in the urinary bladder and urethra due to autoerotism
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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.	The manuscript provides a brief description and follow up for two clinical cases where self-inserted foreign bodies were discovered. I consider that the manuscript has limited interest as it presents the events from a clinical perspective and not as a research study. However, the manuscript could be published if it falls within the scope of the journal.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	No. I would suggest "Pathology of self-inserted foreign bodies in the urinary bladder and urethra"	
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 comprehensive, providing the most relevant data.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes.	
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.	The manuscript is correctly written from a scientific point of view. However, it seems that it lacks complexity and is not as rigorous as a research study. It only presents a limited number of cases. I understand that this pathology is not very frequently encountered but it should still be presented in a more complex manner.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English quality is suitable for publication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

**Review Form 3**

**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>Razvan Nicolae Malancus</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>"Ion Ionescu de la Brad" Iasi University of Life Sciences, Romania</b>