

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_115670
Title of the Manuscript:	Efficacy and reliability of Matrix PRP in erectile dysfunction therapy : Experience of the regenerative medicine center at CHEIKH KHALIFA University Hospital
Type of the 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1- The article is in high scientific importance with a very big hope for this category of patient, which can tackle different disease in the related subject.</p> <p>2- The title could be shaped in different way to emphasize more the subject.</p> <p>3- Not very clear the English needs lots of improvement</p> <p>4- The structure is very bad and this doesn't make the article please to be read</p> <p>5- It is scientifically correct but not well represented</p> <p>6- References are very old, we need references from 2020 and above</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Improvement in the English and grammar needs to be implemented	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	improving in the references, material and methods not well elucidated, Tables and data not well represented, the fluency in the writings.	

### 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>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Charbel Khalil</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Lebanese American University of Beirut, Lebanon</b>