

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medical Principles and Clinical Practice
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMPCP_121755
Title of the Manuscript:	Unilateral dichorionic twin tubal ectopic pregnancy following in-vitro fertilization after a previous salpingectomy- a case report
Type of the Article	Case report

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.	This paper makes a significant contribution to the body of knowledge on uncommon cases of ectopic pregnancy, especially in relation to IVF and other assisted reproductive technologies.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	YES, is suitable and accurately reflects the key aspects of the 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.	The abstract of this manuscript is comprehensive and covers the key aspects of the case report. However, I would suggest a few minor additions to further strengthen the abstract: include a brief statement on the rarity of unilateral twin tubal ectopic pregnancy, with the specific incidence rates mentioned in the main text (1 in 20,000-125,000 pregnancies). provide more details on the patient's clinical presentation, such as the chief complaint (vaginal spotting) and any other relevant symptoms.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes, the subsections and overall structure of the manuscript are appropriate and well-organized.	
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, its sufficient	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I believe this manuscript is a strong addition to the field for a few key reasons: It draws attention to the growing number of ectopic pregnancies—including uncommon variations—that are linked to the growing IVF usage. This is a significant public health concern that needs more attention and study. The case report provides a comprehensive review of the risk factors, pathogenesis, and diagnostic challenges surrounding twin tubal ectopic pregnancies. This knowledge can help clinicians maintain a high index of suspicion for these rare presentations	

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:	Wisam Mashaan Muttaleb
Department, University & Country	University of Baghdad, College of Nursing, Iraq