

Review Form 3

Book Name:	Newer Frontiers in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3899.10
Title of the Manuscript:	NUTCRACKER SYNDROME: ANATOMICAL, PHYSIOLOGICAL AND CLINICAL CORRELATIONS
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The book chapter titled "NUTCRACKER SYNDROME: ANATOMICAL, PHYSIOLOGICAL AND CLINICAL CORRELATIONS" is of significant importance to the scientific community as it provides a comprehensive overview of this rare vascular condition. By integrating anatomical insights with physiological mechanisms and clinical manifestations, the chapter bridges the gap between theory and practice, aiding in early diagnosis and effective management. It serves as a valuable resource for clinicians, researchers, and students, offering a deeper understanding of the syndrome's complexities and promoting advancements in diagnostic techniques and treatment strategies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Yes, it is almost ok.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	It appears to be scientifically accurate, as it meticulously explores the condition's anatomical, physiological, and clinical aspects. By synthesizing current research and clinical evidence, it ensures that the information presented aligns with established medical knowledge.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Few more references should be added.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, it is appropriate.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sumit Nandi
Department, University & Country	Gupta College of Technological Sciences, India