SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JPRI_52561**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The relationship between chronic lower urinary tract symptoms and psychological disorders in women referring to Baqyiatallah hospital clinic in Tehran city**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Grammatical errors should be corrected and revised throughout the manuscript 2. It is a very interesting study, but has failed to establish a clear protocol/methodology of assessing the investigated variables! 3. Some of the statistical methods, if used inappropriately may yield wrong data....There is a mixed concepts of ''association and correlation'' 4. Some of the presented facts are not statistically significant; hence they don't worth a mention as have any influence on the results whatsoever. 5. Bad connectivity between results and discussion. Clarification on retrospective and prospective studies! Was this a retrospective one?!	The corrections have been done
Minor REVISION comments	Row 55: What are the underlying diseases? Row 125: What should be treated, the secondary or underlying diseases? Row 129: There is no available data to support this statement. Row 136: Did Wong et al show a negative or positive correlation? Row 151: Was the effect of ''wetting their underwear'' one of the findings? Row 167: Authors say used '' a healthy and younger population'', is 60 years old subject, young?	
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?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)* Yes The whole study involves human subjects enquiring on some personal matters that require consent. Secondly, the presence of patients/subjects below 16 years of age, needed guardian/parents consents.	