

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The paper is an original article regarding the consequences of steady changes in abdominal pressure during voiding in women on urodynamic diagnosis, and the contribution of analysis of detrusor contractility parameters. The topic is of interest and the finding may have clinical utility. The title is appropriate and reflects the research and the results.</p> <p>The abstract is well written and synthesises the methods of research and the main findings.</p> <p>The strategy of research is appropriate, and the results are clearly presented.</p> <p>The references could be enriched with newer titles and similar previous published studies.</p> <p>The discussions should be developed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The strengths and limitations of the study should be discussed.</li> <li>- A paragraph with the comparison of the findings in the presents study with other previous studies on the same topic should be added.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Some minor English spelling should be corrected.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Dascalu Ana Maria</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Carol Davila University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania</b>