



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_33265
Title of the Manuscript:	The Relation of Hipospadia Types With Hypospadias Objective Penile Evaluation Scorein Padang
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	The authors presented a good work but needs major revisions. 1- The manuscript requires comprehensive linguistic corrections for example: Line 7; hypospasia was (hypospadias is) Line 7; uretral (urethral) Line 8; resulting the (resulting in) Line 12; comparative. (comparative design) Line 17; $p < 0,05$ ($p < 0.05$) Line 31; objectively (objectivity) Line 32; baby ?? Line 35; action (procedure) Line 37; endocrine (endocrinal) Line 41; type (types) Line 45; urethra (urethral) Line 47; action (procedure), large (numerous) Line 49; neo-urethral functional (functional neo-urethra) Line 67; who undergone (who had undergone) Line 69; study conducted (study was conducted) Line 82; dan ?? Line 105; people ?? ... and others that authors should correct carefully. 2- The study design in the methods section would be more valuable if prospective from the start. The authors also included small sample size which is not informative and results cannot be generalized. This	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	represents, in my point of view, a great concern, and it would be better if they included this as a limitation of the study in the manuscript. 3- The authors didn't include a section for statistical analysis they implemented and which statistical test was used. 4- In the methods section, the authors didn't mention what they are going to do in the study. 5- The authors presented in table 1 age distribution of their studied hypospadias patients but it was not clear why they subdivided age into 4 subgroups? and on what rationale? And why not for example to be 2 or 3 subgroups? Plus, they didn't compare the means with resultant p value? 6- In line 81, they mentioned that hypospadias most commonly found in the 10-14 years age.. and this is not true , but I think they meant that the repairs of the hypospadias are the ones that mostly were performed at that age. 7- In line 96, the authors commented on lack of association between HOPE Score and patients age at time of surgery or penile morphology preoperatively? And to reach to this you have to perform univariate analysis, based on this I recommend that univariate statistical analysis with multivariate regression to be performed and	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	presented in another table and other factors to be included e.g urethral plate width, chorde presence .. 8- Again, in the conclusion section which is very crucial, the authors spoke about the incidence wrongly and I think they mean the repair age, so this section should be rephrased and shortened to the point of interest. 9- The authors should provide at least 2 figures for each of distal and proximal hypospadias repairs comparing the satisfied and dissatisfied subtypes.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Tamer Mohammed Sayed Mohammed Dawod</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Urology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Egypt</i>