Nephro-Urology Monthly
Volume 15 · Issue 2 · e135572

OPEN PEER REVIEW

An Evaluation of Monopolar and Bipolar Electrocautery in Transurethral Resection of Urinary Bladder Tumors

Ahsan Ahmad, Md. Zaid Imbista, Khalid Mahmood, Rajesh kumar Tiwari, Bipin Kumar

SUBMITTED	REVISED	ACCEPTED	DOI
13 Feb 2023	30 May 2023	19 Jul 2023	10.5812/numonthly-135572

About this report

This open peer review (OPR) report shows the public comments made on this article during peer review, by the reviewers, the associate editor and the editor-in-chief, for every revision round, together with the authors' replies. Comments appear only with the consent of the people who wrote them. Reviewers who chose to sign their report are named; the others are shown as "Referee". Comments are edited for language only, and confidential remarks to the editors are not included.

More about open peer review: brieflands.com/knowledgebase/opr

Contents

1 Original submission 2
2 Revision 1 Davood Bizari, Associate Editor 3
Authors' reply to reviewers 4
Reviewer and editor comments 7
3 Revision 2 Associate Editor 8
Authors' reply to reviewers 9
Reviewer and editor comments 10

1 Original submission

0 comments

No public comments in this round.

2

Revision 1

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Our Reply To Reviewers' Comments

Comment HR1 :Do not use general words (such as evaluation) in the title as much as possible. The title should indicate the objectives of the study.

Our Response: We appreciate your suggestion but in our study we have compared monopolar and bipolar electrocautery for TURBT. In our study several parameters were evaluated and compared inclusion of which in the title would make title too lengthy. So to keep our title brief we have kept it so.

Comment HR2 : The content is very scattered and needs to be reviewed. For example, this paragraph and the reference in the previous paragraph are presented in a way!

Our Response: We have made it more elaborated as per your suggestion.

Comment HR3 : The text of the method is not well presented and the contents are scattered. Please review the method and present it in a structured way.

Our Response: We have modified as per your suggestion.

Comment HR4: This is a randomized clinical trial. So, revise the study design and provide the following items:

1. blinding

2. intervention and control group

3. ethical code

4. detail of random allocation

Our Response: We have modified as per your suggestion.

Comment HR5: The sample size calculated for the purposes of this study is small and the calculations performed are not in line with the objectives.

Our Response: Primary objective of our study was to compare the occurrence of cautery artifact (also known as thermal artifact) between two groups so we have calculated sample size using this objective. After your suggestion we have clearly mentioned our primary and secondary objectives in the manuscript. Yes ,in our study sample size is small but it still will add information in the existing literature, however we also suggest that more studies are needed in future with much larger sample size.

Comment HR6 : Version?

Our response: SPSS version 15.0 . We added version in this section as per your suggestion.

Comment HR7: According to the number of cases presented, it seems that in some variables you do not have the necessary assumptions to perform chi-square and Fisher's exact test should be used instead.

Our response: For some variables we have used chi square test with continuity correction.

Comment HR8: Independent t-test

Our response: Modified as per your suggestion.

Comment HR9 : Provide more results of basic and clinical variables of patients. A table has been prepared for results not referred to in the text. It is necessary to refer to the table in the appropriate place in the text.

Our response : Modified as per your suggestion.

Comment HR 10 : <0.001

Our response : Modified as per your suggestion.

Comment HR11: There is no need to repeat the results with details and p-value again in the discussion. Please review these items. In the discussion, it is enough to mention the main results obtained and discuss them.

Our response: Modified as per your suggestion

Comment HR12: <0.001

Our response: Modified as per your suggestion.

Comment HR13: 4.33

Our response: Modified as per your suggestion.

Comment HR 14: 1.0

Our response: Modified as per your suggestion.

2 Revision 1

2 comments · 21 May 2023 – 22 May 2023

Davood Bizari Reviewer

MINOR REVISION 21 May 2023

Hello Dear Editor In Chief

In addition to the other reviewers' comments about the manuscript entitled "An Evaluation of Monopolar and Bipolar Electrocautery in Transurethral Resection of Urinary Bladder Tumors", it should be mentioned that this revised version still needs further corrections in the following sections:
1- The abstract still needs to be rewritten to have a better, briefer, and more organized structure and to include more details, such as the number of patients. Also, the conclusion in the abstract can be written more correctly this way: "Bipolar TURBT is BETTER THAN monopolar reducing cautery artifacts".
2- It seems that the full text of this manuscript needs grammar checks and paraphrasing, and the different sections start as continuations of the preceding sections. For instance, in the background, it would be better to arrange previous studies meaningfully in chronological order or in the order of improvements in methods.
3- It is suggested that, if suitable images of the monopolar and bipolar electrocautery methods are available, they be inserted in the text to demonstrate and compare the two different processes for a better conclusion.
4- Generally, it seems that increasing the number of patients could address the lack of data in this evaluation and provide stronger and more reliable data.

Best Regards

Associate Editor

MINOR REVISION 22 May 2023

Minor Revision

3

Revision 2

AUTHORS' RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS

Authors' reply to reviewers

The next pages contain the authors' point-by-point reply to the comments of this revision round, as submitted with the revised manuscript. It is published as the authors wrote it.

Our Reply To Reviewer's Comments

Comment 1 : The abstract still needs a rewrite to have a better, briefer, And more regular structure by mentioning more details such as the number of patients. Also, the conclusion in the abstract can be written more correctly this way: "Bipolar TURBT is BETTER THAN monopolar reducing cautery artifacts".

Our Response: We have modified it as per your suggestion.

Comment 2: It seems that the full text of this manuscript needs grammar checks and paraphrasing and the different sections start as the continuation of the previous section. for instance, the background would be better to arrange previous studies meaningfully in order of years or the order of Improvements in methods.

Our Response: We appreciate your suggestion but as we have compared the outcomes of previous studies in the discussion section , again including these studies in background section will cause the manuscript to cross its words limit.

Comment 3: It suggested that if suitable images of the monopolar and bipolar electrocautery methods are available can be inserted in the text to demonstrate and compare the two different processes for a better conclusion.

Our Response: Surgical steps of monopolar and bipolar transurethral resection were similar; they were different only in the type of electrocautery and irrigant fluid used.

Comment 4: Generally it seems that increasing the number of patients could improve the lack of data in this evaluation and provide stronger and more reliable data.

Our Response: Yes, in addition to our study more studies are needed in future with larger sample size.

3 Revision 2

1 comment · 18 Jul 2023

Associate Editor

ACCEPT 18 Jul 2023

Accept