

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_89731
Title of the Manuscript:	Ovarian metastasis of cutaneous melanoma : literature review illustrated by a case report
Type of the Article	Case study

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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/editorial-policy>)

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>The results and discussion are convoluted and not easy to read, please simplify</p> <p>My remarks:</p> <p>Overall, manuscripts is conducted according to the STROBE guidelines: introduction, methods, results, discussions and comments</p> <p>Generally, the language is difficult to understand and with errors</p> <p>Abstract</p> <p>Please add some more information on the described issue and the neoplastic process</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <p>It is not easy to read , pleas simplyfay and don't start the sentence in the introduction with the word "with"</p> <p>In the introduction please add more details about neoplastic process, the frequency of occurrence in the country and in the world, characters, course and treatment</p> <p>At the whole manuscript there are too few references and too week introduction and discussion</p> <p>References should be identified by Arabic numerals in square brackets, without superscript, and numbered consecutively in the order in which they are first mentioned in the manuscript. Journal names should be cited according to the MEDLINE database. For articles with 4 or fewer authors, all authors should be listed. For articles with 5 authors or more, only the first 3 authors should be listed, followed by "et al."</p> <p>Overall interesting work idea</p> <p>Generally interesting topic but poorly described, weak and too short introduction to topics as well as discussion</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Katarzyna Cyganek
Department, University & Country	Jagiellonian University, Poland