

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research - New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_1802
Title of the Manuscript:	Right-sided Intrathoracic Ectopic Kidney associated with Symptomatic Bochdalek Hernia: Case report and Review of Literature
Type of the Article	Book Chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write few sentences regarding the importance this manuscript for scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is not particularly new with regards to the topic as there have been reported cases since 1988 as the author mentions. The positives in the manuscript are the rarity of occurrence in females and associated bochdalek hernia that make it stand out from other articles. The images are especially good and help the reader get a clear perspective of the case and the disorder. Also, the language is quite good with very minimal grammar and vocabulary issues. What I could not understand was a simple pubmed search for intrathoracic kidney showed multiple recent articles within the last 10 years whereas the author has not referred to any articles beyond 2015, so outdated information may be presented. Secondly, there is no review of literature being done apart from quoting articles. Proper review of literature warrants a comparison of what the author study has done v/s the previous study in order to find differences and similarities (for example, Rahul Gupta et al in 2017 had a similar case where they found the herniation of kidney from Bochdalek foramen, so how the authors case is similar and different could be mentioned)	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title may need modification as literature review is not being done, ArunrajNavaratnarajah et al 2020 doi: 10.5414/CNCS109962 has written a systematic review on the same topic. A narrative literature review while not as comprehensive as a systematic review should at least contain some comparison with other articles or else better to avoid mentioning literature review in the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is quite astute in describing the condition and was easy to understand and concise. Can optionally add the frequency of Intrathoracic kidney with Bochdalek hernia (0.25%) as mentioned already in text, to add emphasis.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsections and structure seem appropriate, not much change is required.	
Please write few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? Minimum 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The manuscript is scientifically sound and correct otherwise. However, more articles from post 2015 should be added to the reference list and incorporated in the article rather than older ones because the articles quoted by the author are quite old. There may be new information missed out and it would hinder future researchers from quoting this article due to its outdated nature. The author has stumbled upon a very rare case and has done a good job in writing the article to educate the readers; therefore, it is essential that more effort is made to compare this article with the previous literature so that it will make it easier for the readers to understand the condition as a whole. Also, to rule out VUR which is more common in ectopic kidneys, a Micturating Cystourethrogram or Contrast Ultrasound or Radionuclide cystography must be done, so it may be worth mentioning that it was not done since the patient was asymptomatic or whatever the reason may be.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.	Sufficient but not recent, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/?term=intrathoracic+kidney can be used to find more recent articles relating to the topic.	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the english is exemplary except for some minor mistakes which are hardly noticeable (example – “Gastrointestinal symptoms like recurrent pain abdomen, vomitings” should be recurrent abdominal pain, vomiting)	
Optional/General comments	The article is overall written well and is of good content for publication, however its quality is hampered by the lack of recent references and an improper literature review without much comparison. If these two main issues are dealt with, it would be good for publication.	

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:	Kiron Krishnaprasad
Department, University & Country	Govt. TD Medical College and Hospital, India