

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_118458
Title of the Manuscript:	The Use Of CTPA In Diagnosing Pulmonary Embolism During Pregnancy And Puerperium Period: A 5 years Retrospective Study At A Regional Referral Hospital in Malaysia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>)

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Many guidelines including RCOG-UK and yours' appear to recommend proceeding with CTPA or V/Q scanning without relying on pretest probability scores. However, it is acceptable to revisit the guideline recommendations. What is the availability of alternative imaging modalities such as V/Q scanning. How many patients underwent V/Q scanning during this period? Risks of CTPA to mother (apart from CIN) and the foetus are not discussed. Would be important to mention in at least one sentence. Many would now question the importance of CIN, which is a transient reversible effect. (Please refer to new evidence on CIN) YEARS score had already been adopted in some countries and incorporated into algorithms in calculating pretest probability prior to CTPA. Why wouldn't you want to adopt that? One MWS score component is Active malignancy or treatment within 6 months- It is unlikely a woman with malignancy or on treatment would become pregnant. So, the score would anyway start 1 less- making the specificity less. If tachycardia is common in pregnancy, what would be the value of increasing the heart rate cut off? Similarly, if D-Dimer is raised why not adopt a higher D-dimer cutoff? Who bear the cost of CTPAs? Hospital or the patients? Major limitation is the retrospective assessment of MWS score, as many are very subjective and depends on the accurate assessment and documentation by the initial assessor. Current electronic investigation ordering systems are incorporated with a well's score before proceeding with CTPA (cannot request CTPA, without answering the well's score to minimize unnecessary CTPAs). I assume you do not have such a system in place. Covid pandemic was an exceptional situation (with increased thrombotic risk) and inclusion of data from that period would make the findings non-generalizable. 2. Yes 3. With minor revisions and explanations 4. Yes 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>I have corrected language and grammar where appropriate. Please see them and accept if authors agree. I have added comments in the manuscript also. Please refer to them as well, as each one cannot be typed here. Go through the manuscript enabling "track changes and show comments".</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	N A Bartholameuz
Department, University & Country	National Hospital, Karapitiya, Sri Lanka