

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-23-9>

Review Comments

Reviewer A

The article titled: Microenergy Acoustic Pulse Therapy for Female Stress Urinary Incontinence is well written, its introduction and main body description are thorough.

Ans: We appreciate the nice comments.

This review summarized the potential mechanisms associated with Li-ESWT and MAP therapies of SUI. As a suggestion, a title more related to this perspective.

Ans: Thanks for the insight. We have revised the title as Microenergy Shockwave Therapies for Female Stress Urinary Incontinence.

This review has the characteristics of a mini-review, so I suggest you have a maximum of 30 references, as per author guidelines.

Ans: Yes, the number of references was reduced to 30.

Reviewer B

The work presented to me for review raises the problem of urinary incontinence - not new, but very common and still valid.

The aspect of treatment of stress urinary incontinence conservatively and especially with electromagnetic field still requires research.

The paper provides a thorough review of the literature on the treatment of stress urinary incontinence with this method.

After reading the work several times, it is difficult to find substantive comments.

I propose to accept the article for publication without comments.

Ans: We appreciate the nice comments.

Reviewer C

The article submitted for evaluation refers to a very interesting topic. The authors thoroughly present aspects of Microenergy Acoustic Pulse Therapy for Female Stress Urinary Incontinence. The manuscript is well structured and reads well.

One remark requiring correction - the review article should be marked with objectivity - here,

especially in the introduction, the authors emphasize their research in this field (which should be praised as scientific achievements), but it should be included in the text as results, not a presentation of the achievements of one team.

Ans: Thanks for the insight. We have updated the introduction section to emphasize the objectivity of this review.