



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 50593

Title: Urethral pressure profilometry in artificial urinary sphincter implantation: a case report

Reviewer's code: 02894774

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's country: Egypt

Author's country: China

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-10-06 05:26

Reviewer performed review: 2019-10-06 07:33

Review time: 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases Manuscript NO: 50593 Manuscript Type: CASE REPORT Urethral pressure profilometry in artificial urinary sphincter implantation: a case report The authors presented an interesting case report on the measurement of MUP and MUCP pre-, during and post- artificial sphincter insertion. There are some points that require correction or modification as follows: Abstract: The authors should write in the manuscript what was mentioned in the abstract: [One month after device activation, telephonic follow-up revealed ...] CASE PRESENTATION The authors should give explanation why the values for MUP and MUCP differed intraoperatively vs postoperatively: The MUP increased from 53 cmH₂O to 89 cmH₂O in the inactivated state, and increased from 112 cmH₂O to 120 cmH₂O in the activated state The MUCP decreased from 109 cmH₂O to 92 cmH₂O in the activated state During the postoperative 6 weeks before activation of the sphincter, what was the condition of incontinence? Was this included in the following: [After 1 month, the number of pads used by the patient decreased from the previous 5 pads/day to 1 pad/day to maintain local dryness, reaching the standard social urinary continence (0-1 pad per day).]. If it is, this means that the symptoms improved even before activation of sphincter? The authors should describe in details this: [In addition, Lowe et al. [8] believe that the cuff may only be slightly attached to the urethra; it provides a higher urethral closure pressure only when the urethral pressure exceeds 100 cmH₂O.] The authors should report the urodynamic evaluation (ALPP) of incontinence after insertion of artificial sphincter. The authors should put citations for: [The definitions used in this article are in line with the recommendations of the ICS.]. [The traditional water-perfused catheter for measuring urethral pressure had strict requirements regarding patient position; it could only measure pressure in one direction, and the accuracy and repeatability were not high.] [Although the methodology of urethral pressure measurement is standardized, to our knowledge, there are no generally

accepted normal or reference values. Chinese experts introduced that the average MUP of a normal elderly man in China is 77 (55-105) cmH₂O, and the reference range of MUCP is 60-80 cmH₂O.] The authors should re-write this sentence in a clear form: [In this study, during activated and inactivated states, the preoperative, intraoperative, and postoperative MUP were 52, 112, 53, 120, and 89 cmH₂O, respectively; during activated and inactivated states, the preoperative, intraoperative, and postoperative MUCP were 17, 109, 50, 92, and 51 cmH₂O, respectively.] The authors mentioned that the main advantage of the current study was: [the intraoperative urethral pressure measurement can obtain the specific values of intraoperative MUP and MUCP, and make a comparison with the postoperative continence of patients to analyze the clinical effects of different urethral pressure to guide the clinical diagnosis and treatment and standardize AUS implantation..]. However, the authors should give more details on how will this guide clinical diagnosis and treatment: What should be done if the measured intraoperative MUCP after insertion of the sphincter was found to be lower (or higher) than the target pressure? What is important, the pressure in active or inactive state?

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

[] Plagiarism

[Y] No