

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_122448
Title of the Manuscript:	RADIOLOGICAL DIAGNOSIS OF EXTRAUTERINE GESTATION USING COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY AND ULTRASONOGRAPHY. A CASE REPORT IN A SPECIALIST HOSPITAL.
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.	This is a rare presentation and can be useful for other physician encountering an abdominal pregnancy. It reminds physicians that such case can appear like normal or tubal pregnancies. It provides guidance for diagnosing via different imaging modalities	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The Title is 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.	The abstract is comprehensive providing a brief intro on the mortality of failure to diagnose and treatment of extrauterine pregnancies followed by the conclusion and case report. I would suggest the authors put the Conclusion after the case report. "...The importance of this case report is to..." should go after the sentence "Biparietal diameter (BPD) measures 35.60mm with a"	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes the subsections are adequate for this publication type. There is abstract, introduction, aim, case report, discussion, and conclusion.	
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.	Please update the images to include the color arrows and stars denoting the referenced anatomical structures. The images provided from the editor are only black and white. Imaging is a critical part of your paper and it is very important for the reader. In the paragraph referring to the publication by Akunaeziri et al. Did you mean to say the placenta was attached to the uterine fundus? Suggest Chen Y et al reviewed 17 cases... Suggest This is unlike our current case report in which... MRI point is a good one but should be moved from conclusion to discussion (or both places, discussion and conclusion (shorter here)).	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes the author has a variety of recent and relevant historical records.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>A lot of cases that advance to term are1-20% and 40-95% respectively. An abdominal ultrasound was carried out establishing the diagnosis of an abdominal gestation/pregnancy</p>	
Optional/General comments	Thank you for your efforts in this importance and critical aspect of medical care. May the Lord Jesus bless you and keep you in your future career.	

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:	John Szczepaniak
Department, University & Country	USA