

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_98721
Title of the Manuscript:	A FALSE TRACT TO A POTENTIAL GRAVE; UNSAFE ABORTION WITH PERFORATED CERVICAL INJURY AND CONSEQUENTIAL SEVERE HAEMORRHAGE. A CALL FOR MULTI-SECTORAL ACTION. "CASE REPORT"
Type of the Article	Case report

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>1. The theme of this manuscript is significantly relevant.</p> <p>2. The title is too long. I suggest making it more succinct. "UNSAFE ABORTION WITH PERFORATED CERVICAL INJURY AND CONSEQUENTIAL SEVERE HAEMORRHAGE: CASE REPORT"</p> <p>3. The summary is adequate!</p> <p>4. The study is chronologically adequate</p> <p>5. Partially. I suggest using a validated instrument to report the case: See: CHECKLIST FOR CASE REPORTS Available at: https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools!</p> <p>6. No. Most references are very old.</p> <p>7. References to epidemiological data are outdated and likely do not represent the current scenario. Authors should seek additional references for discussion, rather than resuming references from the introduction. Due to the relevance of the work, I believe that this is the critical point to review.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	I suggest a writing revision.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The article is relevant.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Michel Marcos Dalmedico
Department, University & Country	Pontifical Catholic University of Paraná, Brazil