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Reviewer's report:

General

Exogenous Glycosaminoglycans coat damaged bladder surfaces in experimentally damaged mouse bladder

This research manuscript is sound scientifically, original, and has a potential to substantiate the role of the bladder mucosa in the pathophysiology of interstitial cystitis (IC). The authors present a concise hypothesis that results in supportive conclusions.

The study answered the question of the distribution of fluorescent labeled glycosaminoglycans (GAGs) in surface damaged mouse bladders by demonstrating that Texas Red-labeled chondroitin sulfate was present in increased concentration in damaged bladders when compared to controls. The findings in the protamine damaged mouse bladders was well explained.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

The data appear to be sound and well controlled. The numbers of mice subjected to each procedure should be stated. The number of sections utilized should be included. Was any blinding procedure for slide interpretation included?

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The methods are well described and offer sufficient details for replication. References for each procedure might be more clearly identified.

The manuscript adheres to reporting standards and data deposition. The data might be represented in a table.

The discussion and conclusions are well balanced and are adequately supported by the data. It would be interesting to know what the concentration of protamine complexed with chondroitin sulfate was in the removed fluid. My copy of the manuscript contained no explanation of figure E. Was this a computer glitch?

The title and abstract accurately convey the results, discussion, and conclusions. The manuscript is well balanced and the discussion provides a scientific explanation for clinical results. A more thorough explanation with any available references might be provided regarding protease exclusion and symptom relief in the discussion section.
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No