

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_96711
Title of the Manuscript:	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ABNORMAL CERVICAL FINDINGS AND ABNORMAL RESULTS AT HYSTEOSALPINGOGRAPHY IN INFERTILE WOMEN
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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 article presents an interesting hypothesis regarding female infertility, with the evocation of multilevel pathological damage to the female genital tract. Starting from a simple observation, verified on a consistent batch of over 300 cases, the findings can bring benefits in the treatment of female infertility. Thus, I consider this research important for the scientific world.</p> <p>Absolutely, the title of the article is well chosen, reflecting the content of the article</p> <p>The abstract fully reflects the content of the article, being eloquent upon simple reading.</p> <p>The article presents in a clear manner the observation of the association between the changes of the cervix and the suffering of the fallopian tubes, this observation being reinforced by well-chosen statistical elements. Also, the chapters of Discussions and Conclusions are presented pertinently, concisely, leaving the possibility of future, more in-depth study, on the occasion of other studies of etio-pathogenic elements</p> <p>The article is certainly correct due to the scientific transparency achieved</p> <p>I believe that the bibliographic indexes chosen are representative.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The English used is correct, abbreviations are explained on first use in the text, keywords are chosen correctly.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cirimbei Ciprian
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Romania