

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**Manuscript NO:** 54658

**Title:** Prospective evaluation of Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROM) after urethroplasty: Is there a 'Trifecta'?

**Reviewer's code:** 02877128

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Australia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-23 07:30

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-23 07:32

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Interesting article and agree with your findings that we need small and precise PROMS.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**Manuscript NO:** 54658

**Title:** Prospective evaluation of Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROM) after urethroplasty: Is there a 'Trifecta'?

**Reviewer's code:** 02894307

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** India

**Author's Country/Territory:** Australia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-25 13:11

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-29 15:48

**Review time:** 4 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Abstract is missing. It is not clear if the same number of men were subjected to the original PROM and modified PROM. Please be explicit and mention how many patients completed each questionnaire. It is well-known that compliance for long questionnaires is poor. Does your questionnaire have only 3 questions? Can you attach your modified questionnaire as an Annexure? These questionnaires are mostly used for research purposes to compare and present data. Will your modification be adequate in that regards? While you mention that the compliance improved. However, did the questionnaire lose its efficacy?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Urology

**Manuscript NO:** 54658

**Title:** Prospective evaluation of Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROM) after urethroplasty: Is there a 'Trifecta'?

**Reviewer's code:** 00383760

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** China

**Author's Country/Territory:** Australia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-03-22

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-04-02 02:43

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-04-02 03:03

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I have the following comments and questions. 1. The authors reported that 18% of patients complied with the original PROM and 91% complied with the modified PROM. How many patients initially complied to the original PROM now complied with the modified PROM? How many patients initially not complied to the original PROM now complied with the modified PROM? How many patients did not comply with both PROMs? 2. The authors reported data on stricture recurrence rate, urinary flow rate, and complications that some of the patients experienced. The authors should try to correlate these with satisfaction about urinary flow, sexual function and quality of life. 3. The first 3 sentences of the Conclusion section with reference 11 should be put in the Discussion section instead. The Conclusion should include a statement of summary of the result, such as that the modified PROM with 3 key questions had a very high compliance rate. 4. The authors should also tabulate the relationship between sexual function and urinary flow to assess their correlation, similar to Tables 1 and 2.