



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 Baqiyatallah 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 6. Clarification on retrospective and prospective studies! Was this a retrospective one?! 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>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?</p>	
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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> 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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Kennedy Daniel Mwambete</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Muhimbili University of Health & Allied Sciences, Tanzania</i>