

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_98075
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF DETRUSOR CONTRACTILITY PARAMETERS HELP TO ANALYZE CONSEQUENCES OF STEADY ABDOMINAL PRESSURE CHANGES DURING VOIDING IN WOMEN
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes No No Well structured. Replace 'Interpretation of the results' discussion. Incorrect technically. Yes The concept of the manuscript was to correlate clinical diagnosis with urodynamic diagnosis. The authors termed it Urodynamic misdiagnosis, with is incorrect judging from the work they did. This creates conflict with the title of the manuscripts, the results and the discussion. The abstract is difficult to understand. Probably due to the discrepancy between the title and the research work . The discussion is not robust. Effort should be made to present the results logically and compare and contrast with existing literature and give explanations where there are conflicts. Other comments are noted in situ in the manuscript.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The manuscript needs proper editing. The English is difficult to understand in certain areas.	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Chima G Ofoha
Department, University & Country	University of Jos, Nigeria