

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_78695
Title of the Manuscript:	CASE REPORT ON WILM'S TUMOR IN CHILDREN
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:

(<https://www.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy>)

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 abstract needs to be better written, the author should only put relevant topics in this topic, not include discussion or case report details in this topic. The conclusion of the introduction describes the case report, which is not the purpose of this topic.</p> <p>The introduction does not need to describe the case or discuss Wilms' tumor treatment.</p> <p>The case report was not well written. I don't see details about the case and the treatment. In the topic of treatment, only the commercial name of the drugs was included.</p> <p>The discussion was poor. In this topic, the author repeats the case report and does not discuss case management. You need to discuss and compare your case with other case reports in the literature.</p> <p>You need to be chronological. The text repeats the same things many times, without chronological sequence.</p>	Noted and corrected
Minor REVISION comments	Exclude repeated parts of text. Put the manuscript in chronological order. You need to detail more the case and make a better discussion.	okay
Optional/General comments	This manuscript was produced without caution and is in need of major revision. The case is not very rare, but it can be interesting if it is well written and well discussed.	okay

Review Form 1.6

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>	