

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_115409
Title of the Manuscript:	Urological Emergencies; Spectrum of cases seen over a three year period in a Tertiary care Teaching Hospital in West Africa.
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community. It investigates urological emergencies in a region where data is scarce (sub-Saharan Africa) and contributes to a better understanding of the prevalence and patterns of these emergencies in the area. This information can be helpful for improving resource allocation and planning healthcare services.</p> <p>2. The title, "Urological Emergencies; Spectrum of cases seen over a three year period in a Tertiary care Teaching Hospital in West Africa" is suitable. It accurately reflects the content of the study.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive. It summarizes the background, objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions of the study.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. It follows a logical flow from introduction to conclusion.</p> <p>5. The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the information presented. It cites relevant references to support its claims.</p> <p>6. The references seem sufficient and recent. However, since this is a review, it would be even stronger to include additional references from across sub-Saharan Africa to show the generalizability of the findings beyond the single center studied.</p> <p>Here are some limitations of the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data source: Relying only on admission register data limits the detail available about the patients. Electronic medical records or additional chart review could provide more details about the cases. • Retrospective nature: Because the study looked back at past data, it can't establish cause and effect relationships. • Single center: The study was conducted at a single hospital, so the results may not be generalizable to the entire sub-Saharan African region. <p>Here are some improvements that could be made for future studies: Include additional data points such as length of hospital stay, readmission rates, and cause of death (when applicable). Conduct a prospective study to gather more detailed information and potentially look at cause-and-effect relationships. Expand the study to include multiple healthcare centers across sub-Saharan Africa to get a more generalizable picture of urological emergencies in the region. The study adheres to ethical principles by not mentioning any patient identifiable information.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The language/English quality of the article is mostly suitable for scholarly communications, but there is room for some improvement. Here's a breakdown:</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>Strengths:</p> <p>The grammar is generally correct. The sentence structure is clear and concise for the most part. The technical vocabulary is appropriate for the field of urology.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement:</p> <p>Sentence fluency: Some sentences could benefit from being rephrased to improve flow and readability. For example, consider the sentence "Urethral catheterization was the commonest emergency intervention (42.57%) which is similar to other studies however the frequency was slightly lower than that from other studies." This could be rephrased as "Urethral catheterization was the most common emergency intervention (42.57%), consistent with findings from other studies, although the frequency here was slightly lower."</p> <p>Redundancy: There is some minor redundancy in phrasing throughout the manuscript. For example, "This study was a three-year (1st January 2019 to 31st December 2021) retrospective evaluation..." This could be simplified to "This was a three-year retrospective evaluation (January 1, 2019 to December 31, 2021)..."</p> <p>Formal tone: While the overall tone is formal, there are a few instances where a more formal phrasing would be better. For example, "Our finding is similar to that of..." could be rephrased as "These findings are consistent with those reported by..."</p> <p>Overall:</p> <p>With some minor revisions to improve sentence fluency, reduce redundancy, and ensure a formal tone throughout, the manuscript would be suitable for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Clearly defined objectives Highlights the importance of the study in the introduction Compares findings to existing literature Mentions limitations of the study</p> <p>Areas for further consideration: The conclusion could be strengthened by elaborating on the implications of the findings. How can this data be used to improve healthcare delivery in the region? Consider mentioning any ethical approval processes that were followed for the study.</p> <p>It investigates a relevant topic in a region with scarce data and presents its findings in a clear and well-structured way. Here's a breakdown of its strengths and areas for improvement: Important topic: The study focuses on urological emergencies in sub-Saharan Africa, a region lacking sufficient data on this topic. Clear structure: The manuscript is well-organized with a logical flow from introduction to conclusion. Sound methodology: The retrospective analysis of data seems appropriate for the research question. Presentation of findings: The results are presented clearly, including comparisons to existing literature. Limitations addressed: The authors acknowledge the limitations of the study, such as relying on admission register data.</p> <p>Areas for Improvement Language improvements: Minor revisions can enhance the manuscript's fluency and flow. Strengthening the conclusion: The conclusion could benefit from elaborating on the implications of the findings for healthcare delivery in the region. Ethical considerations: Mentioning any ethical approval processes followed would strengthen the manuscript.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Thais Ranielle Souza de Oliveira
Department, University & Country	UNIEURO, Brasil