

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_80347
Title of the Manuscript:	Cavoatrial thrombus revealing a renal cell carcinoma
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-policy>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In reference part : reference number 4 and 6 are the same reference So kindly arrange it properly in context of manuscript material 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In case report part : if there is slight deterioration in renal function then what protocol used during contrast CT should be mentioned , and if consequences of contrast induced adverse effects occur or not please mentioned In discussion part : please mentioned All radiology modality that can be used to diagnose the case , also mention merits and demerits of each and every modality. Anil Mandhani, Nitesh Patidar, Pallavi Aga,¹ Shantanu Pande,² and Prabhat Tewari³A new classification of inferior vena cava thrombus in renal cell carcinoma could define the need for cardiopulmonary or venovenous bypass. Indian J Urol. 2015 Oct-Dec; 31(4): 327–332 . doi: 10.4103/0970-1591.166459 : according to this reference RCC described on 3 level and it is recent reference than used in manuscript (reference number 6 in manuscript) so change in it is required if possible by author 	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is very well written. Concept of presenting the manuscript is also good. Some minor revision is needed from my aspect otherwise manuscript is acceptable.	

Review Form 1.6

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kajal Patel</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Institute Of Kidney Disease And Research Centre, India</i>