

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_106311
Title of the Manuscript:	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AGE AND PROSTATE-SPECIFIC ANTIGEN IN AFRICAN MEN SEEKING UROLOGICAL SERVICES AT A REFFERAL HOSPITAL IN KISUMU, KENYA.
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"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> On the whole, the correlation between age and PSA level is well-known, but populational, race-dependent or any local nuances can be the matter of scientific interest. If we take (for example) research of Mehmet Cemil Uygur «The Correlation between Prostate-Specific Antigen and Age» (https://doi.org/10.1159/000480799) 4,846 men were included into the research. For such demographic studies more patients should be included into the study Yes, the title is OK Yes Yes No. <p>1) Why do we need PSA and its relations with age in men? First of all, PSA is not a cancer-specific marker, it is ORGAN-specific marker. PSA can be elevated in men with prostatitis, BPH, after digital rectal examination, after straddle trauma and in men with prostate cancer. It is well-known that men >40 years old can develop histologically BPH. If the patient has acute urinary retention or acute prostatitis, if he had digital rectal examination or transrectal ultrasound PSA is not tested in these patients! Therefore PSA is valuable in men with BPH. Secondly, PSA level – is NOT THE VERY MEASUREMENT THAT ENCOURAGES A UROLOGIST TO PRESCRIBE A TREATMENT for the patient! So, the value of PSA is to find men with CLINICALLY SIGNIFICANT PROSTATE CANCER and to exclude the others. The level PSA in prostate cancer patients depends on the aggressiveness of the cancer, the stage but NOT THE AGE. Therefore, it is not correct to include prostate cancer patients to this study to find correlation with age.</p> <p>2) Table1. – The author included into the study many patients with high PSA (>50 ng/ml). It is well-known that PSA >50-100 means 99% of metastatic prostate cancer and the level of PSA is valuable only for monitoring of the effect of hormonal therapy for prostate cancer.</p> <p>3) There is nothing said about urological medical treatment of these patients.</p> <p>4) There is nothing said what urological services men were seeking and why they had PSA testing</p> <p>5) There is nothing said about all the other complaints of men, LUTS, IPSS, prostate volume, residual urine, etc. that can affect PSA level</p> <p>6) What were the indications for histology specimen retrieval (biopsy for high PSA or BPH surgery)?</p> <p>7) It is not obvious how many patients had BPH, prostate cancer, or prostatitis.</p> <p>8) Why did the author used randomizer application and Yamano Taro formula for cross-sectional study, why they did not add all the patients (80 selected samples mean the whole number of patients was 100)</p> <p>9) There is nothing said about the race of the patients.</p> <p>10) The number of included patients is low.</p>	

Review Form 1.7

	6. No, the references are devoted mainly to prostate cancer,	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English language is suitable.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Andrey Bolotov
Department, University & Country	Pirogov Russian National Research Medical University, Russia