

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_95364
Title of the Manuscript:	Acute Acalculous Cholecystitis as a complication of systemic lupus in peripartum: a case report
Type of the 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.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>1- The manuscript is rather weak due to the small number of samples studied within the pathological condition and the absence of biological parameters that increase the diagnosis of the disease.</p> <p>2- Yes.</p> <p>3- Yes.</p> <p>4- It lacks material and methods, also there is no results.</p> <p>5- To some extent.</p> <p>6- The number of references used are only 10, and 3 of them were modern, which constitutes 30% as a modernity rate.</p> <p>The manuscript is more of a scientific article than being considered as a research paper. If your esteemed journal allows the publication of scientific articles, this article will be valid for publication after making the minor fixes on it.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The manuscript is more of a scientific article than being considered as a research paper. If your esteemed journal allows the publication of scientific articles, this article will be valid for publication after making the minor fixes on it.	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Saba Zeki M. Al-Abachi
Department, University & Country	University of Mosul, Iraq