



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Urology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRU_50806
Title of the Manuscript:	RETAINED URETHRAL CATHETER: NOVEL METHOD OF REMOVAL USING TRANS-RECTAL ULTRASOUND GUIDANCE
Type of the Article	Method 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>)

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	<p>1. The Foleys catheter is a self retain mechanism were the side tube to be inflated. On removing the self retaining catheter deflate the catheter to remove it.</p> <p>2. When the Foleys catheter is not removable even after deflating the author mentions under USG guidelines to puncher the side tube, but it is wrong. Introduce 0.1 to 0.2 ml of ether into the side tube which liquidates the rubber tube and easily the catheter can be removed.</p> <p>3. Advice the author to try with the above mentioned mechanism to ease the mechanism of non deflectable Foleys catheter.</p>	<p>We have corrected the manuscript</p> <p>Done the correction</p> <p>Done</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	