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Reviewer’s report:

Title: The title needs to be modified to state the actual study parameters which were the prevalence of LUTS and the relationship between LUTS, BMI and body circumference. Rather than anthropometric measurements which is broader.

The Abstract: This fair though the background and conclusion could be strengthened

The Background: This does not include any information on the study population, was this a rural population or a predominantly urban population. What is the average social class of this study population. If this is a predominantly urban population of middle class social status, this is a good population for the study, however if it is a predominantly rural population this may not be an appropriate study population.

The Study Objectives: It appears according to the study title that the primary objective was to determine the correlation between LUTS, BMI and MAC. However the way the study objectives are written suggest that the primary objective was to determine the prevalence of LUTS, while the BMI and MAC were secondary objectives.

The Methods: This section contain a lot of citations of web sites, these are best included in the reference section. The reference itself should appear in the text as superscripts. The current format gives the impression of a newspaper article rather than a journal publication. The order of presentations of the methods could be better done, by provide information in this order: the study site, the study population, study tools (reliability and validity), sample size calculation, the sampling technique, the study protocol and the data analysis method. This type of order tends to make the study methods clearer. Since the IPSS is subjective an additional objective parameter should have been added such as postvoid residual urine, or flow rates to supper the IPSS score as a measure of LUTS.

The results: The results presentation can be improved. The current results presentation uses mostly tables. The results can be made clearer by giving descriptive data which will be epidemiological data of the study population. This would compare the key parameters of the 78.8% non-symptomatic and the 20.2% symptomatic patients comparing Age, Social Economic status, BMI and MAC with P values comparing each variable. The results on the correlation between LUTS and age, as well as the severity of LUTS and age are not critical to this study, because the were not listed as study objectives. The Analytical data as presented is fine, but there
is too much text associated with the table. The results should be self explanatory without the need to provide a lot of text with the tables.

The Discussion and Conclusion: The discussion is fair, however some discussion on the study population itself, the mean BMI and the MAC is warranted. It maybe that this was a predominantly rural population where age maybe the major risk factors for LUTS. This is suggested by the title "poor resourced community". This may vary if the population is predominantly urban. It is unclear whether other risk factors for LUTs were excluded such as urethral stricture disease. Given the study population included men of 40year age group.
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