

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57424

Title: Histopathological prognostic factors and survival in metastatic renal cell carcinoma: a retrospective analysis of 95 cases.

Recommendation:

Accept after minor revision.....

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality			✓	
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer's ID: JPR-198

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Minor Revision

This manuscript presents a retrospective single-center study evaluating prognostic factors and survival outcomes in metastatic renal cell carcinoma (mRCC) in a Moroccan cohort. The topic is relevant, especially given the lack of real-world data from North Africa. The study is generally well structured and methodologically acceptable for this journal.

However, the manuscript offers limited novelty and requires improvements in methodological clarity and presentation.

Major Comments

1. Originality and Contribution

The study confirms well-established prognostic factors (IMDC score, performance status, vascular invasion). While useful locally, the manuscript adds limited new scientific insight beyond existing literature.

The authors should better emphasize:

- The regional value of the dataset
- Any unique population-specific findings

2. Methodological Issues

- The sample size (n=95) is relatively small for multivariate Cox analysis → risk of overfitting.
- No clear reporting of:
 - Number of events (deaths) used in Cox model
 - Checks for proportional hazards assumption

International Journal of Advanced Research

Publisher's Name: Jana Publication and Research LLP

www.journalijar.com

REVIEWER'S REPORT

- Univariate analysis using chi-square for survival data is not fully appropriate; survival comparisons should rely more on log-rank tests.

3. Treatment Heterogeneity

There is significant heterogeneity in treatment groups (watchful waiting, bevacizumab, TKIs, IO+TKI), which:

- Limits comparability
- Introduces selection bias

This should be more critically discussed.

4. Statistical Reporting

- Some results lack precision (e.g., “approximately 35 months OS”).
- No p-values or hazard ratios reported for treatment comparisons.
- Confidence intervals should be consistently reported.

Minor Comments

1. Language and Formatting

- Several spacing/typing issues:
 - “variables werecollected”
 - “categorieswereredefined”
- Inconsistent formatting in tables

2. Tables

- Table 2 formatting is unclear (misaligned totals)
- Table 1 lacks clear structure

3. Redundancy

Discussion repeats known literature without deep critical analysis.

4. References

Generally appropriate and up to date.

Strengths

- Relevant real-world dataset from underrepresented region
- Clear study objectives
- Appropriate use of Kaplan–Meier and Cox regression
- Clinically meaningful outcomes (OS, PFS)