



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

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15952

Title: Urethral complications after tension-free vaginal tape procedures: A surgical management case series

Reviewer's code: 00503228

Reviewer's country: Iraq

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-18 18:14

Date reviewed: 2014-12-20 14:38

| 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 overall preparation of some parts of the manuscript is very non-professional, and it is obvious that the authors are not familiar with the principles of scientific writing. Although if the topic is very interesting in the urology era, I think authors may be given another chance to revise the article. Here I give some instances: 1. In the result section of the abstract, you'd see almost no data related to the results of the study. Introduction is too much long. In the methods section, in the second paragraph, "Including urethroscopies..." authors talk about relevance of cystoscopy! Methods section is not where they should talk about such a thing. In the case reports, also, it is conventional to give the manufacturer of the instruments used for the operations.



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

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15952

Title: Urethral complications after tension-free vaginal tape procedures: A surgical management case series

Reviewer's code: 00503175

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-18 18:14

Date reviewed: 2015-01-09 17:01

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input checked="" 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 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

Article "Urethral complications after tension-free vaginal tape procedures: Surgical management in a case series" by Sergouniotis Fotios et al. is according to my opinion, acceptable for publication. This article is very interesting for persons involved in the treatment of stress incontinence. Authors presents their experience in the treatment of urethral erosion after tension-free vaginal tape procedures. They clearly explained their diagnostic and therapeutic approach. Also, they performed unusually and rare but very interesting operation of transurethral excision of the intraurethral part of the mesh. Very interesting and usefull article. Congratulations to the authors.



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15952

Title: Urethral complications after tension-free vaginal tape procedures: A surgical management case series

Reviewer's code: 00503339

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-18 18:14

Date reviewed: 2015-01-05 22:31

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input checked="" 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

While the details for the 9 cases presented give moderate details of the surgery's impact on life quality, it would be helpful to learn the Authors judgment of whether or not to classify the surgery as generally successful. As presented in Table 2, 4 of the 9 women required reoperation after mesh removal to correct the impact of erosion into the bladder of the corrective mesh. While Tables 1 and 2 are helpful, it would greatly improve comprehension of the techniques employed to have a staged diagram of the steps in placement of the corrective mesh as initially employed. Finally, do the tension-free vaginal tape procedures improve life quality sufficiently to advocate their use with greater frequency? The Authors might state their current view of whether their feeling that "urethral complications after sling procedures might be more common than described in the literature" is sufficient reason to restrict this surgery in potential candidates according to conditions that they might list. Overall, the intervention clearly has limited benefit in approximately one-half of women to whom it is applied (Table 2).



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

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Nephrology

ESPS manuscript NO: 15952

Title: Urethral complications after tension-free vaginal tape procedures: A surgical management case series

Reviewer's code: 00503176

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2014-12-18 18:14

Date reviewed: 2015-01-06 19:11

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | 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

It is a rather lengthy manuscript on a case series, however, I find it very instructive since each individual case was described in way that it could be instructive for daily practice. it is generally not common to so extensively elaborate a small case-series, but in this particular case I think it is useful (as it presents detailed experience). I think that Figure 1 is superfluous..could be simply put in words.