

Review of: "The Role of Platelet Rich Plasma Injections in Cases of Stress Incontinence"

Amerigo Ferrari¹

¹ Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies

Potential competing interests: The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

Dear Editors and dear authors,

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to revise this article. The topic is interesting because platelet-rich plasma (PRP) is a novel technique with increasing application to different clinical fields. As far as I know, this technique is safe, non-invasive, beneficial, and with few side effects. So, this study raises an important and innovative research question, as PRP may represent a novel, alternative, conservative therapy for stress urinary incontinence (SUI).

However, I am afraid this study doesn't have the statistical power to infer a causal relationship between PRP treatment and improvement in SUI symptom intensity as a control group is lacking and the number of women enrolled is too low. With your study design and data, you can just make suggestions. Therefore, I strongly suggest performing a power analysis to understand how statistically powerful this study may be. Also, I suggest considering the MID (minimally important clinical difference) in the questionnaire scores you employed, which can be used for power calculation.

Furthermore, the article needs grammar and spelling checking. The Method section should be reorganized in a more narrative way, suitable for scientific publications. The Discussion requires re-writing. First, the description of the study limits should be expanded. Secondly, you should avoid describing in the Discussion findings ("second endpoints") you did not mention in the Result (and Method) section. Thirdly, I would structure the Discussion paragraph this way: main findings and comparison with previous studies; limits and strengths; implications.

See below for further details on each section.

My best regards,

Dr A Ferrari

Title

Perhaps, "Platelet Rich Plasma Injections as a Potential non-invasive Therapy for Stress Urinary Incontinence: A

Prospective Study” would be more appropriate

Abstract

- Background: I suggest modifying “in the quality of life in the female” to “in the quality of life of women”. Also, specify the acronym for SUI at this point: “Stress urinary incontinence (SUI) ...”, otherwise the readers find “SUI” in the Conclusion and cannot understand what you are referring to
- Aim: “To” should be in capital letter
- Patient and Methods: I suggest “This prospective interventional study was conducted at Sayed Galal hospital on 20 patients seeking treatment for urinary stress incontinence who attended the clinic or were admitted to the hospital.” I also suggest adding in this section how stress urinary incontinence (SUI) was assessed. Therefore, I would add here “Treatment efficacy was assessed using the International Consultation on Incontinence Questionnaire-Short Form, the Urogenital Distress Inventory, the Incontinence Impact Questionnaire and the Overactive Bladder Symptom Scores
- Results: “We found a significant incontinence improvement at both 1 month and 3 months post treatment.” Perhaps, it would be helpful to have more quantitative information: which scores declined significantly after the intervention? How was the p-value? Also, the statistical analyses you performed should be specified. If you don't want to add this information in the Method section, you could start the Results section this way: “Bivariate analyses revealed a significant incontinence improvement at both 1 month and 3 months post treatment”.
- Conclusion: “Local injection of autologous platelet rich plasma is an effective, affordable, and safe procedure that has the potential to become a new non-invasive therapy for SUI.” Sounds better.
- Recommendations: “PRP may represent a new safe, effective, and non-invasive technique for treating female SUI.”. Please, specify the acronym PRP when it first appears in the text (in the “Aim” section).
- Keywords: Please, use the same spelling for “non-invasive” throughout the text. In the “Aim” you wrote “non-invasive” while in the Keywords “noninvasive”.

Introduction

I would rather say “Urinary incontinence can impact women’s social, physical, mental and sexual wellbeing”. Also, “It is commonly acquired”: I would rather say “It usually occurs”

The Introduction is well-written, centered, and attractive. Good job!

Aim of the work

This is my proposal: To suggest the role of platelet-rich plasma as a novel potential non-invasive treatment for SUI

Patient and Methods

Generally, I prefer a more narrative description of the methods. I do not know if the decision to structure the Method section this way – with this point-by-point description – was a choice by authors or an editorial layout guideline. However, I kindly suggest re-writing the Method section in a more explicative way, if this is in line with the editorial preferences. For instance: “This is a prospective interventional study carried out at Sayed Galal Hospital from February 2021 to January

2022. We included 20 women aged over 35 years and suffering from mild to moderate SUI, who attended the clinic or were admitted to the hospital. We excluded ... etc.”.

I would not define your study as a clinical trial. “Prospective interventional study” is more appropriate.

The main problem with the Method section is that you did not perform any power analysis. This should be specified. I believe that the numerosity of your study cohort (20 patients) does not allow inferring clearly a causal relationship between PRP treatment and SUI self-reported improvement. Moreover, you lack a control group. I feel that all such issues should be specified in the Discussion section as the main limits of your paper. Despite these limitations, the study maintains its relevance, so you can stress the importance of furtherly testing PRP as a new therapy for SUI. However, with your work you can just make *suggestions* rather than *conclusions*.

Furthermore, I recommend mentioning the so-called MID (minimally important difference) which is the minimal reduction in the PRO (patient reported outcome) scores corresponding to a significant clinical benefit. I think that you reached such difference; therefore, I suggest just to cite it. Finally, the paragraph “Ethical consideration” needs editing. Usually, the number of the protocol by which your Institution approved your study should be reported.

In general, this paragraph is the more problematic. First, because I feel that it needs language and layout editing to facilitate the reading. Secondly, I would stress more the fact that the study design does not allow inferring causation.

Results

Table 2 is not so clear. Please, consider modifying it, or add a legend to better explain what you want to show.

Further details on the Questionnaires used in this study may be useful. How do they range? Which items do they include? How should be interpreted? Which is the MID?

Discussion

The first paragraph is identical to the beginning of the Introduction section. Please, modify it. You should present the main findings of your study and compare them with previous publications on the same topic.

“This study aims to assess...”: As I said, I would be more cautious and rather say that your study wants to suggest the role of PRP as a potential novel non-invasive therapy for SUI.

You cannot mention your secondary endpoints at this point of the paper. You should better explain which are your study endpoints in the Method section, and then report them in the Results.

The description of the study limits requires further discussion, as previously said.

“The Results of this study show that about sixty-eight women in the age ranging from 32 to 97 average: 62.8 years old) were enrolled in this study”: Please, consider modifications to better clarify that you are referring to the previously mentioned study you are citing.

“Similar to this study, Ariel Luksenburg...”; This phrase needs to be grammar check. Please, do not report the title of the paper you want to cite.

In general, the Discussion needs grammar checking and layout re-organization. I recommend the following structure: Main findings and comparison with other studies; Limits and strengths; implications. You cannot cite results you never mentioned. You have to be more precise in citing previous articles. You have to expand the Limit discussion.

Conclusion

I have never seen an exclamation point in the Conclusions of any paper.

Recommendations

I would be more cautious in reaching such conclusions. As I said, with your study design and results I would just *suggest* the potential usefulness of PRP for SUI treatment. I would rather stress the novelty of your study research question and the innovation of testing PRP as a non-invasive therapy for SUI.

Final comment

I give three (out of five) stars just because the topic is very interesting and the potential application of PRP for non-invasive SUI treatment is innovative and attractive. However, I am afraid the study is not enough powerful, and strongly requires language, grammar, and layout editing and check.