

Review Form 3

Book Name:	Newer Frontiers in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3899.9
Title of the Manuscript:	APPROACHES TO EMPHYSEMATOUS PYELONEPHRITIS: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS AND MANAGEMENT PREDICAMENTS
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 provides critical insights into the complex and life-threatening condition of Emphysematous Pyelonephritis (EPN), a rare yet significant medical emergency. By addressing unresolved questions and management challenges, it sheds light on diagnostic classifications, risk factors, and therapeutic interventions, which are pivotal for improving patient outcomes. The detailed exploration of Huang and Tseng's classification system and associated prognostic indicators enhances our understanding of disease severity and guides evidence- based clinical decision-making. Furthermore, this work underscores the importance of multidisciplinary approaches, including early diagnosis, medical management, and minimally invasive techniques, to mitigate morbidity and mortality in patients with EPN. It is a valuable contribution to the scientific and medical communities, advancing both research and clinical practice.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	

Review Form 3

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	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	yes	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	yes	
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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Javid Ahmad Mir
Department, University & Country	Kashmir University, India