

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ARJGO_108742</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Investigating Pelvic Organ Prolapse in Bangladeshi Women: An In-depth Epidemiological Analysis and Recommendations for Women's Health Care</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

## 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><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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></b></p>	<p>1. In Introduction, please justify importance of the study on women in Bangladesh. Why you believe women in Bangladesh are at high risk of POP? Any other relevant issues? Any previous research on health costs related to POP in Bangladesh? Surgery costs,....?</p> <p>In addition, Introduction needs a review and being rewritten, in particular the last 3 paragraphs. They seems most related to method and conclusion section.</p> <p>2. Title is suitable</p> <p>3. Abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>4. In method section, authors should describe how they placed women in two groups of POP and Non POP. How they were diagnosed with POP? Was there any physician in the research team? Or The women self reported that they suffer from POP?.....</p> <p>5. Discussion section needs a thorough review to provide a deeper scientific discussion around relationship between the independent variables and POP, how they affected POP in previous studies populations, if there is any implications/interventions in the previous studies,..... The current discussion just presents the current study's results along with support from a couple of previous studies back to more than 10 years ago with no deep discussion.</p> <p>6. References need to be updated. Studies on POP are growing over the last 5 years. So, the authors of the manuscript should refer to most recent studies to make a better discussion and more practical implications for health sector.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	Yes	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	Discussion part and references need to be reviewed and rewritten thoroughly.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Sara Shishehgar</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Nursing, Charles Darwin University, Australia</b>