

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_125805
Title of the Manuscript:	Vaginal hysterectomy for uterine inversion caused by uterine leiomyosarcoma about a case.
Type of the Article	Case Report

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

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>
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>This particular case warrants reporting in the literature because leiomyosarcoma is a rare malignancy and its presentation as a prolapsing mass causing uterine inversion is not typical. However, I do not like the way the discussion was written.</p> <p>It would have been better if the discussion focused on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Explain how the leiomyosarcoma prolapsed and predisposed to uterine inversion - if no known pathophysiology, the author should give his own theory. 2. Discuss why vaginal hysterectomy is the most appropriate surgical intervention for this particular case. Was resection of the mass done before proceeding with the vaginal hysterectomy? Emphasize the failed attempts to reposition the uterus. <p>A case report should highlight the uniqueness of the case. It should not just be a simple topic discussion as was done in this paper. There was extensive discussion of vaginal hysterectomy, leiomyosarcoma and uterine inversion but there was no correlation of these topics to the case at hand.</p>	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Vaginal hysterectomy for a non-puerperal uterine inversion secondary to prolapsed leiomyosarcoma, a case report	
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.	Write 1-2 sentence/s on what the case is about. Management of the case follows. Sentences should be simple. Avoid using compound sentences. In this case, there was only 1 sentence for the abstract but there were so many information written.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It would be better if the clinical case and the discussion follow a systematic and clear format. Perhaps it would be better to talk about the presenting symptoms and other important details in the history first, followed by the objective findings. Based on the history and physical examination, what is the assessment and what intervention was employed. Discussion of these points should follow the same order.	
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.	As I have written above, a case report should not just be a topic discussion. It should highlight the uniqueness of the case. What makes it different from the usual leiomyosarcoma? How often does leiomyosarcoma prolapse and consequently cause uterine inversion? Justify why resection of the uterine mass followed by vaginal hysterectomy is the most appropriate intervention for this particular case.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are old. It would probably be better if references used are 5-10 years old only.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Grammar, choice of words and sentence construction can definitely be improved.	
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:	Carolyn R. Zalameda-Castro
Department, University & Country	University of the Philippines - Philippine General Hospital, Philippines