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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This manuscript is important for the scientific community as it highlights a novel and multifactorial approach to addressing erectile dysfunction (ED), a condition that significantly impacts quality of life. By exploring the connection between colonic *H. pylori* strains, inflammatory cytokines, and pelvic congestion, it introduces a unique perspective on the pathophysiology of ED, emphasizing the potential role of gut health in sexual function. The study further contributes to the field by investigating the effectiveness of alternative therapies, such as colon cleansing and blood-letting cupping, providing a non-pharmacological treatment option that warrants further investigation.** **I appreciate this manuscript for its innovative integration of gastrointestinal and vascular perspectives in understanding ED, as well as its focus on holistic therapeutic strategies. However, the study would benefit from a larger sample size and more detailed descriptions of the methodology to ensure the reproducibility and reliability of its findings. Despite these limitations, the research offers a promising direction for future studies.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? **(If not please suggest an alternative title)**	**Yes**	
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.	**Yes**	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Yes**	
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 minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**This manuscript appears scientifically robust as it draws upon established physiological mechanisms, such as the role of nitric oxide (NO) in erectile function and the impact of inflammatory cytokines on vascular health. The association between colonic *H. pylori* strains, cytokine production, and pelvic congestion is well-documented, lending credibility to the proposed link between gastrointestinal health and erectile dysfunction (ED). The study's integration of therapeutic approaches like colon cleansing and blood-letting cupping is grounded in a hypothesis that aligns with the observed pathophysiological processes.** **The technical soundness of the study is supported by its structured therapeutic regimen and the inclusion of measurable outcomes, such as improved erectile function and sexual satisfaction. However, the manuscript would benefit from a more rigorous design, including control groups, detailed statistical analyses, and a larger sample size, to strengthen the validity and generalizability of its conclusions. Overall, the study provides a solid foundation for further exploration of alternative therapies for ED.**	

Review Form2

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. **-**	**Yes**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Yes	
Optional/Generalcomments		

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)*	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Marvis Arowolo**
Department, University & Country	**University of Missouri, USA**