

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	

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>Review comment on "Efficacy and reliability of Matrix PRP in erectile dysfunction therapy : Experience of the regenerative medicine center at CHEIKH KHALIFA University Hospital". Methodological shortcomings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ A randomized study would be indicated to verify the therapeutic effectiveness of a molecule in comparison to the placebo, as other studies on the PIP product have done. This allows the results to be compared to those in the literature. ✓ In the absence of a randomized study, the present study should have been a historical cohort. Which implies an analytical study and yet it is a purely descriptive study that was carried out. ✓ Patient selection criteria must be specified. Aware of multiple causes of erectile dysfunction, organic and non-organic, I fail to see how one molecule would prove its effectiveness on all these causes. ✓ Patients should be categorized into three groups: mild, moderate and severe erectile dysfunction. ✓ Indicators for monitoring erectile function, with IIEF5 in the lead, should be defined. ✓ In the present study, the assessment of the therapeutic action of the molecule tested is completely arbitrary, based only on the patient's declaration, and does not seem to me to be supported by the statistical analyses. ✓ In each category of erectile dysfunction, we had to monitor the evolution of the average IIEF5 score and the proportion of patients changing category after each injection of the molecule tested. Insufficiency of form: <p>✓ Figure 1: Percentage of patients whose IFE5 showed improvement.</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>Optional/General comments</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:	Pascal Bayauli Mwasa
Department, University & Country	University of Kinshasa Hospital, Democratic Republic of the Congo