

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-23-1877>

Review Comments

Reviewer A

The Integral Theory becomes Integral Theory System. The multidisciplinary research group of Prof. Peter Petros works since many years following these principles and reaching up to 80% cure of LUTS. No other therapeutical strategy could solve entirely these disorders.

After hostility showed by many urologists and gynecologists, this system seems to be actually the best and only chance to change the paradigm in understanding symptoms of pelvic floor disorders.

This understanding has NOTHING to do with the FDA ban of meshes used in prolapse surgery!

The text is logical to understand, pictures and videos are convincing.

A very good paper, nothing to mention against.

Reply: Thank you.

Reviewer B

This was a very good review paper, the illustrations, descriptions and details were thorough. My only one suggestion would be to focus on lines 315 to 317. On line 315 to 317 the authors concluded 316 that post-menopausal women required collagenopoietic slings for adequate repair of their prolapse and 317 symptoms. Following on from this statement, perhaps the authors could write a brief summary of the impact of not having a repair of the prolapse, and the effect this may have on activities of daily living.

Overall, this was very good and worthy to be published.

Reply: Thank you. This is a good suggestion, but it is potentially a very large topic and it moves away from the anatomical emphasis of the paper.

Reviewer C

REPLY

Dear colleague

Thank you for your comments, which we found to be most helpful.

Thank you for submitting your article to ATM Journal. The manuscript is an update of the Integral Theory Paradigm (ITP). Article nature requires other complementary studies to understand the holistic nature of the ITP and it consists of 60 videos and 11 figures that help to systematically understand the structural, functional, and dysfunctional pelvic anatomy.

The article presents a very particular structure, even if it is a review. Perhaps its understanding would require more audiovisual and textual support to complement the reviewed one. However, it is considered appropriate that the authors clarify the reason for what is contained in the section “What is new?” Please, improve the structure and writing of the abstract. Try to describe the content in a cohesive way.

Reply: Thank you. We have restructured “what is new” section and have totally rewritten the abstract.

Regardless of the technical or scientific sound, it is estimated that a better presentation and organization would greatly help the visualization and understanding of the content.

The latter is sometimes not sufficiently clear. Additionally, titles/subtitles/sections are presented with different sizes and fonts, which contribute to reading dispersion.

I kindly request for an orderly restructuring of the work and a better presentation of the proposed review.

Thank you in advance.

Reply: Thank you. We agree. We have spent some significant time in re-organizing the headings and how the paper flows.

We have made major headings size 14 bold, subheadings 12 bold with their own line, with sub/sub headings size 12 italicized and continuing on the same line.