

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_103339
Title of the Manuscript:	LIFE THREATENING MISDIAGNOSIS: SCAR ECTOPIC PREGNANCY
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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. Yes</p> <p>2. Author can modify the title to make it more relevant to this case.</p> <p>3. Yes</p> <p>4. Introduction and discussion are very haphazard, it does not deliver the message author would like to give to readers, I request the author to kindly improve the discussion, case report, and discussion part .it need to be concise.</p> <p>5. Yes, scientifically correct. I request the author to Kindly concentrate on clinical presentation, investigation, and management rather than on misdiagnosis or Lawsuits. Rather highlight the warning signs of scar ectopic and best or gold standard investigations.</p> <p>6. Inadequate references. Reference no 1 and 2 have no details. Reference no 5 is too old. kindly provide more and recent references relevant to your case report.</p> <p>7. Kindly go through the instructions for manuscript preparation carefully.</p> <p>8. Follow guidelines for images. Provide representative images with titles and brief details use markers if required.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Need spelling and grammar check.	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sachin Suryawanshi</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>MUHS, India</b>