

Reviewer's report

Title: Failure Rate of Vasectomy Using Cautery

Version: 1 **Date:** 2 April 2004

Reviewer: Jay Sandlow

Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) None.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct) None.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

1. One potential problem is that, although the study took place in 4 different sites, there were 14 total investigators. How were inter-investigator differences in techniques controlled?
2. This same group has recently submitted a similar paper regarding the effectiveness of fascial interposition. However, the failure rate in that paper was significantly higher (13% w/o fascial interposition, 6% with fascial interposition). How do the authors address this difference in failure rates (quoted as 0.8% in this paper)?
3. I would not cite submitted, but unpublished, references (ie. references 1 and 8), but rather, cite them as unpublished results. Furthermore, this type of data can be cited in the Discussion, but I do not think it belongs in the Introduction, which is typically reserved for more conventional references.

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No

Declaration of competing interests:

None