

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_104266
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POST TURP OUTCOMES AND COMPLICATIONS BETWEEN BENIGN PROSTATIC HYPERPLASIA PATIENTS, PRESENTING WITH AND WITHOUT ACUTE URINARY RETENTION
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalajrru.com/index.php/AJRRU/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The abstract was not properly written. It lacks results and conclusion. Abstract should not carry abbreviations.</p> <p>They are not appropriate.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Need to provide recent references</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Comments.</p>	<p>The introduction should be summarized. The rationale for the study should be incorporated in the introduction. Separate heading for the objectives is not necessary. Research question is wrong, though not necessary. The inclusion criteria: why prostate size of 30mg to 110mg? Q-max is a measure of the severity of LUTS and obstruction. How did the authors arrive at the cut-off? Age range was 45-75yrs, why? Patients with urethral stricture, prostate cancer, neurogenic bladder and unwilling patients do not qualify for the study hence cannot be part of the exclusion.</p> <p>The manuscript should be written in past tense, as the study has been concluded. The whole manuscript should be rewritten to reflect a manuscript.</p> <p>The writeup is more of a proposal. Results should be separated from discussion.</p> <p>Conclusion should give key findings and then make recommendations.</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> <p>No</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

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