

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_113183
Title of the Manuscript:	WHAT IS THE BEST INDEX FOR EVALUATION OF DETRUSOR CONTRACTILITY IN WOMAN DEPENDING ON URODYNAMIC DIAGNOSIS AND AGE?
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>1- Yes, this study bridges a notable gap in comprehension and clinical application, thus contributing substantially to the advancement of the scientific community in urology and its related disciplines.</p> <hr/> <p>2- Title needs modified as: 1- Assessing Detrusor Contractility in Women: A Comparative Study of Urodynamic Diagnosis and Age. 2- Determining the Ideal Index for Assessing Detrusor Contractility in Women: Insights from Urodynamic Diagnosis and Age</p> <hr/> <p>3- Yes</p> <hr/> <p>4- Subsections and structure of manuscript needs formatting changes.</p> <hr/> <p>5- Yes, but it may have some limitations or flaws that warrant consideration. The research appears to be acceptable, but a more comprehensive evaluation or refinement of certain aspects could enhance its scientific robustness.</p> <hr/> <p>6- References need up gradation, all quoted references are from 10-12 years old previous studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Quality of English is not formal yet acceptable for understanding of this research work.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Overall, Research topic is good but Author needs to work on basic formatting, reference updating and improvement in manuscript information.</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:	Tayyaba Mustafa Mian
Department, University & Country	Fatima Memorial College of Medicine and Dentistry, Pakistan