

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Achievements and Challenges of Medicine and Medical Science
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_3638
Title of the Manuscript:	Male Pelvic Congestion and Erectile Dysfunction Obscure Reasons for an Obvious Phenomenon among the Young
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	I found it interesting. The manuscript will be improved if the author introduced a conceptual model on the etio-pathogenesis of ED, right from the outset, in which all the elements described in the introduction are comprehensibly assembled. The rest of the manuscript must use the premises and predictions of such model to comment the experimental design, to present the results, y to frame the discussion.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Please adjust the title: It is uninformative and unrelated to the content Is <i>Helicobacter pylori</i> a cause of male pelvic congestion and consequently of erectile dysfunction in young and old males?	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It is easy to follow, but must be improved.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No problem with that. Please introduce more information on the techniques (including protocols) used to gather information. The social, medical, instructional and other epidemiological information about the patients must be introduced. How was recruiting accomplished? Please, provide information (No. protocol) of the approval obtained from the ethics committee. Describe in detail the statistical methods used to data analyses. Describe the results thoroughly. Provide actual data of the research conducted.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Correct all I have just said en the previous sections	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	For a brief communication is fine. Not for a book chapter. For a book chapter, it lacks an in depth analyses of the literature. Correct all I have just said en the previous sections	

Review Form2

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English OK. Minor typos. Improve the linking between paragraphs and the coherence of the discourse	
Optional/General comments	Is a preliminary text that must be improved before being considered. The idea is very interesting.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gabriel Gutierrez Ospina
Department, University & Country	Universidad Nacional Autonoma De Mexico, Mexico