

Reviewer's report

Title: DOES DOPPLER FLOW PATTERN CHANGES IN PATIENTS WITH TESTICULAR MICROLITHIASIS ? REPORT OF THREE CASES

Authors:

Ramazan Kutlu (rkutlu@inonu.edu.tr)

Ahmet Sigirci (asigirci@inonu.edu.tr)

Tamer Baysal (tbaysal@inonu.edu.tr)

Alpay Alkan (aalkan@inonu.edu.tr)

Kaya Sarac (ksarac@inonu.edu.tr)

Version: 3 **Date:** 26 Nov 2001

Reviewer: Dr A Laviopierre

Level of interest: A paper of limited interest

Advice on publication: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the compulsory revisions

1. The general setting-out should be revised, with much of what is currently under "Conclusions" reorganised under "Discussion" and a shorter, sharp conclusion drawn.
2. The authors need to list the type of equipment used.
3. The images have not reproduced well in the format in which they are currently displayed. The resolution is poor.

In terms of specific questions:

1. The conclusions (as mentioned, most of which are currently a discussion) need to be more thoroughly supported by detailed data of peak systolic velocity etc. in all cases.
2. With the article as it stands at present, appropriate drawing of conclusions and reproducibility of results is difficult. Generally, the paper is in the format of case presentations, rather than a series, which is fine, but makes the conclusions stated a little thin (although the general thrust of the paper is good).
3. In terms of adhering to standards, this is dealt with above.
4. The writing as it stands is, unfortunately, not acceptable for publication. There are substantial errors of grammar and syntax : e.g. "applied to our department for infertility", inappropriate use of articles such as 'the' and 'a', and no articles where they should be (e.g. "the" right and left testis), verbs omitted, and so on. Even the title contains a mistake.

The paper needs to be re-written in better English.

I am also unaware of what a 'spermiogram' is.

The references are well researched and highly appropriate. Note, however, that a reference which does not appear to belong to the paper has been inserted above reference 1.

Generally, I believe that the authors should re-write the paper in better english, re-organise it and re-submit it.

Competing interests:

None declared.