

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_82634
Title of the Manuscript:	Socio Behavioral Factors Associated with Nocturnal Enuresis among Primary School Children in Abo Homous, Elbehira, Egypt
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>General Comments: The authors of the paper have studied nocturnal enuresis (NE) among schoolchildren in both a rural and an urban part of Egypt. A huge number of subjects (n= 65045) have answered questionnaires regarding demographic, familial factors, and criteria of NE in the population studied. The purpose has been to measure the prevalence of NE and the relation between NE and socioeconomic factors. The study comprised 1085 patients with NE. The prevalence of NE was 13.9 %. The occurrence of NE was related to several different factors. The statistical analyses seem to be performed correctly. However, the paper has several problems, of which some are mentioned under specific comments.</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The questionnaire is not available. The reader cannot evaluate the questions. In addition, the circumstances are not described for the procedure for response to the questionnaire. The authors refer to 'Appendix 1', but it is not enclosed with the paper.2. There are many repeats in the paper. Thus, at the end of Introduction, the aim is given twice. Several others examples exist, but it is difficult to refer to specific parts of a manuscript, which have no pagination.3. The tables are informative and clear. The text in Results is very difficult to read. Most of it should be rephrased and the most important points from the tables should be stressed in the text.4. In Discussion, the results are repeated to a large extent. It is correct to refer to others results, but there is no explanation regarding discrepancies to results from other studies, and the authors do not interpret the importance of their data. Thus, what should be the consequences of the study? What are the advices to the health care authorities?5. In Introduction, the authors correctly mention the classification of NE in primary and secondary cases. It is understood that this classification is extremely important when you want to evaluate socio-economic factors contribution to the disease. A much more relevant approach to the study would be to primarily divide the population in patients with primary NE and secondary NE and make the statistical analyses on both group separately. We know from many studies that heritage plays an important role in primary NE and socio-economic factors are very important in development of secondary NE. For the local society and the readers in the authors' surroundings, it must be very important to clarify which socio-economic factors are essential for secondary NE.6. In several places in the text, the authors mention that an association exists between to variables, but they do not explain what it means.7. The conclusions are about the whole population with NE without differentiation between primary and secondary NE. The conclusion is not helpful regarding the problems for the children, families or health caretakers in the society.8. English revision of the paper is necessary.9. The reference lists comprises 28 numbers. Most of the references are from countries in the Middle East. In addition, one from India, one from China and one from Brazil. It seems as if the authors have not read European or North American literature.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Erling Bjerregaard Pedersen
Department, University & Country	Holstebro Hospital and Aarhus University, Denmark