

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_96463
Title of the Manuscript:	UTERINE RUPTURE ASSOCIATED WITH PLACENTA ACCRETA IN A COMMUNICATING PSEUDO-UNICORNUS: A CASE REPORT AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
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)
<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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The manuscript UTERINE RUPTURE ASSOCIATED WITH PLACENTA ACCRETA IN A COMMUNICATING PSEUDO-UNICORNUS: A CASE REPORT AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE is of great importance to the scientific community as a rare case of pregnancy complications with uterine malformations. This, in turn, is life-threatening for the pregnant and the fetus.</p> <p>In my opinion, the title reflects the essence of the article. The title is coherent and meaningful.</p> <p>The abstract of the article is very comprehensive. The abstract summarises the content of the article.</p> <p>Are the subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct, meeting generally accepted criteria as well as the criteria for reporting a clinical case.</p> <p>This statement from sentence «<i>Uterine malformations are abnormalities of the development of the Müllerian ducts and represent 1 to 4% in terms of prevalence in the population.</i>» must be backed up by an appropriate reference.</p> <p><i>The discovery of a uterine malformation during pregnancy is rare. Indeed, in the literature, the prevalence of these cases is estimated at 1/100000 or even 1/140000. This statistical assertion must be supported by appropriate reference. Three other cases have been described since 1945 in the literature.</i></p> <p>This suggestion is flawed in fact, as summing up the two references offered, more than 3 cases can be distinguished.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	The quality of language is good, appropriate for scholarly communication.	
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>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Aleksandr Urakov
Department, University & Country	Izhevsk State Medical Academy, Russia