

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (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.	Cervico-vaginal fistula are an important subject. These cases are interesting but don't add a real new knowledge to the problem. The English is very faulty and there are also typos. Overall I dislike the manuscript because of the errors it is tiring to read. I have the impression, that major publications on the subject are not reflected, the selection of cited literature seems rather random.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Very faulty, moderately comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
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.	Moderate correctness: the literature is rather random and seems fast selected, major reviews and meta-analyses are not integrated. The conclusion is not very precise and specific.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	I think, they are not. Important to my opinion would be for example: <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34981462/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34981462/</a> <a href="https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28225769/">https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28225769/</a>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Sorry: not at all. Major corrections needed.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It would be great if these cases could be published, but the manuscript needs major revision. Minimally a revision concerning the English language is necessary.	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Ivo Faehnle</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Switzerland</b>