

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_102587
Title of the Manuscript:	CASE REPORT:A RARE CASE OF MISPLACED COPPER - T IN APPENDIX ALONG WITH APPENDICITIS
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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes. Valuing abdominal pain in patients with a history of IUD use.</p> <p>2. Yes, is the title of the article suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. No. The authors need to adapt the text of the description of the anatomopathological exam, as well as the description of the surgical procedure. The surgical description must be corrected with technical details.</p> <p>5. No, the authors must correct the text with more detailed information from the ultrasound examination and also from the surgical finding.</p> <p>6. No, the references are old and the most recent one is 22 years old. there are more recent articles in the literature.</p> <p>In the text the authors use many abbreviations, which cause confusion in the reader's reasoning.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Adequate, but could be better.	
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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valdemir José Alegre Salles
Department, University & Country	University of Taubaté, Brazil