

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_124327
Title of the Manuscript:	REPRODUCTIVE OUTCOMES IN TWO NIGERIAN WOMEN WITH SEPTATE UTERUS: CASE SERIES AND LITERATURE REVIEW.
Type of the Article	

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)
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.	The manuscript is a commendable work of compilation of two similar cases of separate uterus and their management leading to good reproductive outcome. Hence this will add to the existing literature reinforcing the fact that mullerian anomalies of this kind can be managed by judicious follow up and result in good reproductive outcomes.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title of article is pertinent brief and concise	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive though the demography details, socioeconomic strata, family history of patients and their age of the cases were not compared to address the factors related to infertility/ pregnancy losses in the cases.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Subsection of manuscripts are lacking in follow up of the cases post the surgical correction and metroplasty to assess the outcome of these procedures. This is important because in both the cases the separate uterus was an incidental finding and with good follow up of the cases both reached beyond 36 weeks and underwent Caesarians. The correction of the septum was probably done with a view to enable better reproductive outcome in future pregnancies.	
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.	Yes the manuscript is technically sound and robust as it displays the photographic evidence of timelines in the course of pregnancy	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	nil	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English is grammatically sound	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shahla Abraham
Department, University & Country	Govt Hospital, India