

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_123505
Title of the Manuscript:	Case series of vesicovaginal fistulae in Nizwa Hospital, trend, outcome and Review of literature
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

<u>Compulsory</u> 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.	It is important for scientific community as VVF is debilitating condition affect quality of life and increasing day by day due to iatrogenic causes so need research in this field to evaulate various surgical techniques to treat and manage these cases. Like diagnosis by CT urogram and pictures given in this case report	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable	
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.	Discussion should be 500 words	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Appropriate	
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 it is scientificallyrobust and technically sound It is supported by investigation and management and also need further research on large data Easy to read It tell inside of problem	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient It should be within 10 years	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

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:	Anila Mujadid Qureshi
Department, University & Country	Liaquat University of Medical and Health Sciences, Pakistan