

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_103199
Title of the Manuscript:	Quality of Life of Patients with Interstitial Cystitis: A Systematic Review
Type of the Article	Review 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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.7**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1-There is an importance of this manuscript to the community as it list down the possible strategies of treating interstitial cystitis and bladder pain syndrome.</p> <p>I think the title should mention something about the treatment strategies of interstitial cystitis and bladder pain syndrome</p> <p>The abstract is quite comprehensive</p> <p>The author needs to do more subsections in the introduction and the results. He/she needs to put each objective in one part like the impact on the quality of life, the main factors that deteriorate quality of life and the implemented therapeutic strategies</p> <p>The references are quite enough and cover all the listed materials</p> <p>As far as I am concerned this research can be categorized as a narrative or literature review rather than a systematic review. Systematic reviews mostly answer one specific question like success or failure of certain therapeutic strategy or the relation of a certain factor with the incidence of certain condition. In this article the author mentions that he/she did a systematic review for the assessment of quality of life in interstitial cystitis patients but the team he/she passed through several aspects related to the interstitial cystitis like the main signs and symptoms, risk factors and treatment strategies. That is why I think that the article should be considered as a literature review rather than a systematic review.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The language is quite good but the author mentioned some abbreviations without interpretation like PICO in the flow chart</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>There are several points to rise</p> <p>1- The author mentioned in the manuscript that the results of the selected articles were placed in an excel sheet which is mostly for meta analysis but in the result there is no any meta analysis</p> <p>2- The manuscript is more narrative literature rather than a systematic review as it answers several questions</p> <p>3- The discussion and conclusion are just repetitions for the findings, extracted from the selected journals.</p> <p>4- The articles selected do not answer the same question but they take different aspects of the disease</p> <p>5- It is preferred for the author to look at one aspect only like effect of certain risk factor, success of certain therapeutic strategy or incidence of the signs and symptoms on different age groups to list it as a systematic review.</p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Zaid Osama Ibraheem</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Ashur University College, Iraq</b>