



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10436

Title: Penile prosthesis: patient satisfaction, use and preference for malleable versus inflatable

Reviewer code: 02884931

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 16:13

Date reviewed: 2014-04-01 20:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall a good report. Response rate is low but I see no way to fix this. Some grammar needs to be cleaned up and I have provided some examples. You make a statement in discussion about global dissatisfaction, and I disagree with this based on your data and what is known about prostheses. This is an interesting concept that sometimes older or less complex works just as well. Patient and Method (should be Patients and Methods) We collected data from (the) medical record (including) follow-up, age and type of prosthesis. We (made) contact with each patient for a telephone survey. (Prior) to the survey (each) patient was informed of the content and objective of the survey and (consent was obtained) In discussion, the statement "Anyway, there are unsatisfied patients with surgery, esthetic result and/ or functional results. Rigidity, length, infection, spontaneous deflation or mechanical failure are the main reasons for the patient low-rate global satisfaction." does not really make sense. Your data and also known information suggests that satisfaction is high. Consider revising this statement.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Urology

ESPS Manuscript NO: 10436

Title: Penile prosthesis: patient satisfaction, use and preference for malleable versus inflatable

Reviewer code: 02459176

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-03-31 16:13

Date reviewed: 2014-04-23 16:25

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a interesting article using a retrospective design, but less innovation. The results of the data are acceptable. Overall the manuscript is well written especially for the authors with English as non-native language. Still, the limitation exist that moiety of the cited references were before 2000, in addition, it's better modified the tables as three-line tables and impressive graphs may be helpful. Therefore, the manuscript need some editorial work.