

[Review Form 3](#)

Book Name:	Newer Frontiers in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3899.7
Title of the Manuscript:	MANAGING GALL BLADDER PERFORATION IN THE SETTING OF PERCUTANEOUS NEPHROLITHOTRIPTY – CHALLENGES AND CLINICAL INSIGHTS
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.	This manuscript addresses a critical and underreported complication of percutaneous nephrolithotomy (PCNL)—gall bladder perforation. By highlighting the case of a patient who experienced this rare event, the authors provide valuable insights into the risks associated with PCNL, particularly in relation to anatomical proximity between the gall bladder and kidney. The findings emphasize the importance of early detection and prompt intervention, which can significantly reduce morbidity and mortality. This work contributes to the scientific community by enhancing awareness among urologists and surgical teams regarding potential complications, thus improving patient outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Managing Gall Bladder Perforation in the Setting of Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy – Challenges and Clinical Insights" is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and focus of the manuscript. However, a more concise alternative could be: "Gall Bladder Perforation During Percutaneous Nephrolithotomy: Management and Insights."	
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 generally comprehensive but could benefit from including specific outcomes related to the case presented, such as recovery time and postoperative complications. Additionally, a brief mention of the implications for clinical practice would enhance its relevance.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically accurate, with a well-structured presentation of the case and relevant literature. The authors effectively discuss the risks associated with PCNL and provide evidence-based recommendations for management.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references cited are sufficient and mostly recent; however, including additional contemporary studies on similar complications could strengthen the manuscript. Consider adding references that focus on advances in imaging techniques or surgical approaches that mitigate such risks.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is generally suitable for scholarly communication. However, minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing in some sections could be improved for clarity. A thorough proofreading is recommended to enhance readability.	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript effectively highlights an important clinical issue that may not be adequately addressed in current literature. The authors' experience provides practical insights that can guide future practices in managing similar complications.	

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhishek Singh
Department, University & Country	SHKM Government Medical College, India