

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_127842
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Endometrial Hyperplasia in Cases Admitted with Abnormal Uterine Bleeding (AUB) at Our Hospital
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is significant for the scientific community as it addresses the prevalence of endometrial hyperplasia (EH) in patients with abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB), a common yet diagnostically challenging gynecological condition. By providing data on the proportion of EH cases, particularly those with atypia, the study contributes to understanding the local epidemiology of this premalignant condition and give valuable insights for clinicians for managing AUB.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title could be improved for a more professional and concise presentation. As this study is only located in one single center. As i suggested alternative title: Prevalence of Endometrial Hyperplasia Among Patients with Abnormal Uterine Bleeding: An Analysis from a Single Center.	
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 generally well-structured and includes key components (background, methods, results, and conclusion).	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	the manuscript is scientifically correct, but addressing whether menopausal status, risk factors of endometrial hyperplasia and discussion of patient management strategies would enhance its comprehensiveness.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references provided in the manuscript are relevant, authoritative, and include foundational texts like the WHO 2014 classification and ACOG guidelines. However, some references are dated, such as the ACOG Practice Bulletin (2012) and studies from 2009 and 2010. While these are still valid, incorporating more recent studies would enhance the manuscript's currency.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language of the manuscript suitable for scholarly communication. However, It could benefit from minor improvements in grammar and some type error.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update older references and include recent studies to strengthen the manuscript's relevance. - Expand on the implications of the findings for clinical practice, particularly how the results might inform screening or management guidelines for abnormal uterine bleeding. 	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in detail)</i> Based on the provided content, the manuscript does not appear to have significant ethical concerns.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	M. Fidel Ganis Siregar
Department, University & Country	Universitas Sumatera Utara University, Indonesia