

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Surgery
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRS_125502
Title of the Manuscript:	Brain Metastasis of Papillary Ovarian Adenocarcinoma
Type of the Article	Case report

[Review Form 3](#)

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<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 offers significant value to the medical community by addressing the rare but critical occurrence of brain metastasis in ovarian adenocarcinoma, a condition not frequently documented in oncology literature. It underscores the importance of incorporating neuroimaging in post-treatment surveillance, which could facilitate earlier detection and improve prognosis for patients with epithelial ovarian cancer. The detailed case presentation, including surgical resection and multimodal therapy, contributes to a deeper understanding of treatment strategies for metastatic brain lesions. Expanding on the long-term clinical outcomes would enhance its utility for neuro-oncologists and gynecologic oncologists.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Brain Metastasis of Papillary Ovarian Adenocarcinoma," is informative but could be refined better to reflect the focus and clinical relevance of the manuscript. A more precise and engaging title could be:</p> <p>"Brain Metastasis in High-Grade Serous Ovarian Adenocarcinoma: A Rare Case Report and Treatment Approach"</p> <p>This title highlights both the rarity of the case and the specific type of ovarian adenocarcinoma, while also emphasizing the treatment strategy, which is important for clinicians and researchers.</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>	<p>There are a few areas for improvement to make it more comprehensive:</p> <p>Suggestions for Addition: Please note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The abstract mentions surgery and chemotherapy but lacks details on the multimodal treatment strategy, including radiotherapy, which is a key part of treating brain metastases. It would enhance clarity to add a sentence about the treatment regimen, including outcomes. It would be beneficial to include the patient's prognosis and survival outcome post-treatment to give the abstract more clinical relevance. Adding information about the follow-up period or whether the patient experienced a recurrence of brain metastasis would give readers a fuller understanding of the clinical management. <p>Suggestions for Deletion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The phrase "we would propose that patients treated for ovarian carcinoma could include brain imaging on the list of follow-up studies" is speculative and may not be necessary in the abstract. This can be elaborated on in the discussion instead. 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>Recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consider Additional Subsections: If space permits, consider adding subsections under the discussion to delineate different topics, such as "Clinical Management," "Prognosis," and "Future Directions." This would allow for a more in-depth exploration of each aspect. Visual Aids: Including tables or figures summarizing key data or treatment protocols could enhance understanding, particularly for complex information. 	
<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>The manuscript exhibits commendable scientific accuracy and technical rigor, supported by meticulous methodology and comprehensive data presentation. By contextualizing the findings within existing literature and providing insightful analyses, it significantly contributes to the understanding of brain metastases in ovarian cancer.</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 references cited in the manuscript are sufficient and generally up to date, providing a solid foundation for the study's findings; however, the inclusion of additional recent studies could further strengthen the discussion and context of the research.</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes , It's suitable .	
Optional/General comments	The font size and formatting need to be adjusted to align with the journal's guidelines.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rida Aziz
Department, University & Country	CMH Medical College, Pakistan