

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRIMPS_99409 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | TRANSURETHRAL MONOPOLAR RESECTION OF THE PROSTATE: experience of AMIROU BOUBACAR HOSPITAL IN NIAME |
| Type of the 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.journalajrimps.com/index.php/AJRIMPS/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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>It is encouraging information for newer Urologists to confirm for themselves that TURP remains the gold standard surgery against which all other procedures are compared. However, it does not add any fresh information to existing knowledge on the subject.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Very few references of last 2-3 yrs. More recent references could be added.</p> <p>The gold standard for TURP is bipolar TURP and no longer monopolar TURP, therefore it's a little confusing that the author says that he has done the gold standard procedure, however the title mentions monopolar TURP. The methods does not clearly state whether monopolar or bipolar TURP has been done.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>There could be an overall improvement in the grammar/language of the article.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

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) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name: | Gagandeep Singh |
| Department, University & Country | Army College of Medical Sciences, India |