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Reviewer’s report:

General

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

As a preliminary report, this is important. With the increasing expense and regulation of clinical research, well conducted pilot studies are extremely valuable. Without them neither “own investigator” nor commercially sponsored studies, will be initiated, with serious consequences for future pharmacological discovery. The authors should perhaps give the dates as to when this work was done since presumably it was before the recent European Regulations were enacted in Portugal.
It is to be hoped that based on these findings the authors will include carry out a future placebo controlled trial and include studies of the suburothelial innervation in prove their hypothesis that RTX is having its effect by a specific effect on TRPV1 receptors in the urothelium and sub-urothelial C-fibers and that these have an important role to the generation of urgency sensation in OAB syndrome.

The study of “urgency” is very topical as it is a controversial area of research but central to our understanding of OAB syndrome. The absence of a Portuguese word for “urgency” is interesting and the explanation of the devised scoring scale seems entirely reasonable.
This particular group of workers have had greater success than many others in obtaining therapeutic benefit from very low concentrations of RTX and the findings here provide additional supportive data for the efficacy of a 50 nM dose. Perhaps the fact that they have had these results using such a low dilution should be stressed.

The paper states “this study was presented in part elsewhere [20].” Some further information about this should be given. Reference 20 is an abstract. Does this simply mean the findings have been presented at a scientific meeting?

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The paper states “this study was presented in part elsewhere [20].” Some further information about this should be given. Reference 20 is an abstract. Does this simply mean the findings have been presented at a scientific meeting?

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, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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