



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>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:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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? <p>I recommend this article for publication in the journal, after taking into consideration the present comments.</p>	
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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Grigore T. Popa</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania</i>