

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_128434
Title of the Manuscript:	Does hormonal status affect outcome of aromatase inhibitor maintenance post-adjuvant chemotherapy in high grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC)? Single center experience
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript addresses a significant gap in the management of high-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC) by evaluating the role of aromatase inhibitors as maintenance therapy in resource-limited settings. Its focus on cost-effective and well-tolerated endocrine therapies provides valuable insights for regions where standard maintenance options, such as anti-angiogenic agents and PARP inhibitors, are often inaccessible. The detailed analysis of hormonal receptor profiles and their correlation with clinical outcomes advances our understanding of personalized treatment strategies for hormone receptor-positive HGSOC. Additionally, the study's findings emphasize the need for further research to refine predictive biomarkers and optimize endocrine therapy in ovarian cancer, contributing to the global effort to improve long-term survival outcomes in this challenging malignancy.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Title is ok	
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 but could benefit from minor refinements for clarity and balance. Suggestions: Add: Briefly highlight the implications of findings for future research or clinical practice. Clarify: Mention the patient subgroup with worse disease-free survival (e.g., younger patients) to provide a nuanced summary. Delete: Redundant phrases like "particularly in resource-limited settings," as this is implied in the study context.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears scientifically sound, with a clear research hypothesis, appropriate methodology, and thorough statistical analysis. The randomized clinical trial design strengthens its validity, and the use of robust biomarkers like ER and PR H-scores adds credibility to the findings. However, the lack of significant differences in primary outcomes and the limitations in sample size and follow-up duration should be acknowledged when interpreting the results. Overall, the conclusions are consistent with the presented data, making the manuscript scientifically correct.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are ok, few more references of recent years if possible are suggestive to add to make it a better manuscript.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abu md ashif ikbal
Department, University & Country	Assam University, INDIA