

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13106

**Title:** An update summarising the conclusions of the International Consultation on Male LUTS

**Reviewer's code:** 00505626

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-06 18:20

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-14 04:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google 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 is a review article about the conclusions of the International Consultation on Male LUTS. The manuscript is well written, I enjoyed reading it and it gives very important information for the general urologic readers

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13106

**Title:** An update summarising the conclusions of the International Consultation on Male LUTS

**Reviewer's code:** 00467918

**Reviewer's country:** Afghanistan

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-06 18:20

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-14 18:01

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review on the conclusions drawn by an international consultation in LUTS. In the introduction section additional information should be provided explaining what is this text about (a review of authors, a review of a review done by the consultation etc). Within this paragraph authors need to provide more information regarding the International consultation (organizer, participants etc) and maybe a reference for somebody to be able to examine it in more details (URL of congress site?). Time when the consultation was organized is also important to be mentioned. Authors review only 4 out of 8 themes discussed in the consultation. Thus authors need to explain why they decided to review only 4 out of them. A conclusion paragraph should also be included. Tables including the majority of suggestions by the consultation should be included after each subject to summarize the outcomes of consultation. In epidemiology paragraph, text regarding reference 5 is wrong. Authors report that "Prevalence estimates for an elevated IPSS score above eight range from 16 to 52%. A pooled analysis of 126 studies has shown an increase in prevalence with age from 21% to 32% for elderly men [5]". Authors use a systematic review on urinary incontinence studies [reference



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

5] and confuse elevated IPSS score with UI (as the reported increase refers to UI in reference 5 and not to IPSS score).

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 13106

**Title:** An update summarising the conclusions of the International Consultation on Male LUTS

**Reviewer's code:** 00468558

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2014-08-06 18:20

**Date reviewed:** 2014-09-16 03:48

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input 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

The paper is clear, well written and concise. It summarizes expert panel opinion and international guidelines. It is therefore of extreme interest for the urological community. It would be even more interesting if Authors discussed a little bit more about behavioral and surgical treatment options beyond medical therapy.