

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_122294
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessing the true prevalence of endometriosis: A narrative review of literature data
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript 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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -		
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is a duplicate publication. A paper with same title is published in July 2024 in the International Journal of Gynecology and obstetrics. Link of the same is https://doi.org/10.1002/ijgo.15756 . The authors have also cited this paper as reference 16. 2. There is no clear declaration by the authors about the replication of the results of any previously published paper. 3. Methodology of this manuscript is also same as that of the mentioned published paper. Flow chart of the literature search and tables of the type of studies is not there. 4. Results and discussion are absent in the manuscript. 5. Conclusion is based on the data presented inside the manuscript. Critical analysis of the literature is clearly mentioned. The strengths and weaknesses of the studies are discussed but not clearly defined. Authors have also given suggestions for further research. 6. References cited are relevant but not adequate 	

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:	Shameem Ahmad Rather
Department, University & Country	Regional Research Institute of Unani Medicine, India