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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.
   Comments: No ethical concern. A statement is present at the end of the article

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.
   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity): OK
      - Main symptoms of the patient: OK
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history: No
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes: OK

   b. The relevant physical examination findings: OK
c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at $T = 0$, follow up at $T = 1$ month.

OK

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention: OK

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

OK

Comments:

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: OK

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: Yes
8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: Yes

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

Observations:

1. It is very difficult to accept the overwhelming number of authors of THIRTEEN (13) for a simple case report. Eleven of the authors are from the Department of Urology, and two are from the Department of Pathology of Charles Nicolle Hospital, Tunis, Tunisia. I think it would be acceptable a maximal amount of four authors, who were most likely involved in the management of this case: One clinical urologist, one surgeon, one radiologist, and one pathologist. However, I cannot believe that to describe a kidney with tuberculosis, they required the participation of THIRTEEN physicians; this is not a multi-institutional clinical trial or something like that.

2. The image in Figure 1 is of very poor quality. I have optimized this image for better resolution, contrast and sharpness (see attached).

3. The histopathology image in Figure 2 at very low power and with no detail a sound histopathological diagnosis, and not enough for the diagnosis of tuberculosis; I would suggest including images at a higher power (200x and 400x) demonstrating the cellular components of the granuloma lesion, including Langhans giant cells, and if possible, the presence of acid-fast bacilli with proper specific staining.

4. The narrative of the text and the grammar are very poor, and I have attached a version with activation of the "track changes" and with some suggestions to clarify the information being presented.
5. The terms "genitourinary," "urogenital," "urinary," "renal" are used indistinguishably from each other, when they represent completely different terms, some of them involving several organs. These terms need to be clarified based on the references cited.

6. The reference number 5 is the same as reference number 1 and one of them needs to be deleted and replace their respective numbers in the text.

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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