

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_102797
Title of the Manuscript:	Giant Bartholin Cyst in a Sexually Active Widow: Management and Aspects of Neglected Sexuality
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	yes yes yes yes Add following references Klingele CJ, Gebhart JB, Croak AJ, DiMarco CS, Lesnick TG, Lee RA. McIndoe procedure for vaginal agenesis: long-term outcome and effect on quality of life. American journal of obstetrics and gynecology. 2003 Dec 1;189(6):1569-72. Goh SP, McCully B, Wagner MK. A case of adenoid cystic carcinoma mimicking a Bartholin cyst and literature review. Case Reports in Obstetrics and Gynecology. 2018 Mar 26;2018.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The quality of the figs is unsatisfactory. Fig 2 and 4 can be deleted. Fig 5 and 6 are of very bad quality: should be deleted if it is not possible a better quality.	
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:	Nicola Basso
Department, University & Country	Sapienza University of Rome, Italy