

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16004

**Title:** Pioneering drug candidates for overactive bladder syndrome and detrusor overactivity: ongoing research and future directions

**Reviewer's code:** 00742250

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-23 09:01

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-24 15:46

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This review article, though a little too long, has a scientific value to be published in the WJOG.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16004

**Title:** Pioneering drug candidates for overactive bladder syndrome and detrusor overactivity: ongoing research and future directions

**Reviewer's code:** 00742249

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-23 09:01

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-11 13:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Comments: The authors reviewed the ongoing research on pioneering drug candidates for the overactive bladder. This manuscript provides useful information to the medical students, clinicians, and researchers in this field, therefore, is acceptable for publication in World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. That is all.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16004

**Title:** Pioneering drug candidates for overactive bladder syndrome and detrusor overactivity: ongoing research and future directions

**Reviewer's code:** 00742253

**Reviewer's country:** Lithuania

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-23 09:01

**Date reviewed:** 2015-01-21 16:47

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would like to congratulate the Authors with the “big job” trying to summarize the possible today treatment for overactive bladder syndrome. But, reading this article, I have a feeling alike I am checking “pharmacologic catalog”. This is a review. Usually a review has specific “writing design”: how did you revise the literature, how did you found out what “is good” what “is wrong”, why have you decided that this is the best and etc. What we expect from review, we expect not only “record” but the analysis and conclusion as well. I suppose, you have to shortening this article and summarize what do think today is the best and what do you would like to suggest for the readers.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 16004

**Title:** Pioneering drug candidates for overactive bladder syndrome and detrusor overactivity: ongoing research and future directions

**Reviewer's code:** 00742054

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-12-23 09:01

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-29 18:28

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for your great work. The paper is too long and needs to be shortened in some sections. There are also 312 references and not all of them are required to be cited. The authors need to remove some unnecessary references.