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Reviewer's report:

The study has the merit of being a pioneering work to explore in a technological and elegant way the impact of IPP on LUTS/BPO. However the study presents some limitations. First of all, it is poorly written. A revision of English is mandatory. Other limitations are the following:

Background:
I suggest a better definition of IPP.

Methods:
The study enrolled only 10 patients in 14 yrs (2000-2014), why is there such a small number of patients in such a long period of time? What are the enrolment criteria that you adopted? How was it made the diagnosis of prostatic hypertrophy?

IPP could be a parameter with great intra- and inter-variability during its assessment; how did you evaluate the IPP in your cohort?

What were the results of UDN study in the enrolled patients? May you better explain them in the manuscript?

Discussion:
I suggest you point out some limitations of the study.
For example: I suppose that the model was built with Asian patients, these results should be confirmed in a larger multicentre study that involves African/Caucasian patients.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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