Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJCRS_63896**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Unusual Presentation of Emphysematous Pyelonephritis (EPN): "Double trouble" A Case Report.**
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:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy)

SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The authors discussed the topic correctly, presented appropriate previously published studies correctly stressed. The article submitted presents an interesting clinical case, although there are some shortcomings: 1) The abstract should be written clearly and well structured (introduction, clinical presentation, conclusion) 2) In the introduction chapter: it would be useful to complete the information about the emphysematous pyelonephritis, in addition they should be supported by references. 3) In the Case report chapter: How is diabetes treated? Is diabetes balanced or imbalanced? 4) In the Case report chapter: You should write the units of measure after each specified value (eg. Mmol/L or mg/dL) 5) In the Case report chapter: You should write red blood cells (in the urine) instead of blood, abdominal and pelvic CT instead of CT abdomen and pelvis 6) In the Case report chapter: What antibiotic was administered? How long was the treatment given? How long after the recovery was completed? 7) In the Discussion chapter, the following sentence should be rephrased: After the introduction of minimally invasive percutaneous drainage, the management shifted towards it and yield better outcome. 8) In the Discussion chapter: Which patient was followed for 10 years? The 63 years old patient with EPN? I recommend this article for publication in the journal, after taking into consideration the present comments.	Done the revision Correction made Done Corrected Done Done Revised Made revision
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	