

Review Form 3

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJRRE_121075 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | SPONTANEOUS HETEROTOPIC PREGNANCY AFTER A PREVIOUS IPSILATERAL OOPHORECTOMY: A Case Report |
| Type of the Article | Case report |

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

| Compulsory REVISION comments | Reviewer's comment | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it documents an extremely rare case of spontaneous heterotopic pregnancy following ipsilateral oophorectomy, contributing valuable clinical insights. It highlights the importance of maintaining a high index of suspicion for heterotopic pregnancies even in natural conceptions. The discussion on potential mechanisms and comprehensive management strategies enhances understanding and guides clinical practice. The detailed case presentation and thorough discussion make this a valuable educational resource.</p> | |
| <p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> | <p>The title is clear and informative, effectively capturing the essence of the case report.</p> | |
| <p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider correcting the typographical error in "spontaneous" to "spontaneous." 2. The sentence structure can be improved for better readability. For example, "It has an incidence ranging from 1:30,000 pregnancies of spontaneous conception to 1:100 to 1:500 with the use of assisted conception" could be revised to "The incidence ranges from 1:30,000 in spontaneous conceptions to 1:100 to 1:500 with assisted conception." | |
| <p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> | <p>The manuscript's subsections and structure are appropriate, effectively organizing the information into clear sections such as the abstract, introduction, case presentation, discussion, and references. Each section flows logically, enhancing the overall readability and comprehension of the manuscript.</p> | |
| <p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p> | <p>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound, as it thoroughly documents a rare clinical case with detailed descriptions of the patient's presentation, diagnostic findings, and treatment outcomes. The discussion is well-supported by relevant literature, explaining the potential mechanisms and management strategies for heterotopic pregnancy. The use of evidence-based references further validates the scientific accuracy and reliability of the information presented.</p> | |
| <p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> | <p>The language quality of the article is generally suitable for scholarly communications, but minor grammatical and typographical errors should be corrected to enhance clarity and readability.</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correct typographical errors, such as "spontaneous" to "spontaneous" and "48hours" to "48 hours." • Simplify complex sentences for better readability. • Ensure consistency in citation formatting and numerical values. | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>Overall, the manuscript is well-structured, scientifically accurate, and supported by sufficient and recent references. Minor revisions to language and typographical errors will further improve its quality.</p> | |

Review Form 3

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: | Manasa Samala |
| Department, University & Country | CMR College, India |