

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
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 <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 contributes significantly to the scientific understanding of maintenance endocrine therapy in epithelial ovarian cancer (EOC), particularly in resource-limited settings. It addresses the critical question of whether aromatase inhibitors can serve as an effective, low-cost maintenance treatment for ER/PgR-positive FIGO stage III/IV high-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC). By presenting robust clinical trial data, the study clarifies the limited efficacy of this approach despite its safety and affordability, filling a gap in the literature regarding hormonal therapy in advanced EOC. These findings provide valuable insights for clinicians and researchers, guiding future investigations and treatment strategies for HGSOC.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is clear and relevant, but it could be refined for precision and impact. While it highlights the focus on hormonal status and AI maintenance, it does not fully convey the study's findings or its implications in resource-limited settings. A more informative and engaging title could be: "Impact of Hormonal Status on Aromatase Inhibitor Maintenance Therapy Outcomes in High-Grade Serous Ovarian Cancer: A Phase II Study"	
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 gives a good overview of the study background, methods, results, and conclusions. But it would be nice if the abstract included the study objectives. Also more specific data on recurrence rates or disease-free survival, even if the differences are not statistically significant. And a summary of the results for clinical practice, especially in resource-limited settings.	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Based on the data provided, the manuscript appears to be scientifically sound, follows a typical clinical trial structure, and presents its methodology, results, and conclusions in a logical manner.	
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 comprehensive and relevant to the study on endocrine therapy in ovarian cancer, in particular aromatase inhibitor maintenance therapy. However, 18 of the 26 present data more than 5 years old, and 5 are more than 10 years old.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Based on the provided content, the language of the article appears to be largely suitable for scholarly communication.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Consider rephrasing the title to emphasize key aspects of the study, such as its randomized design, focus on endocrine therapy, or findings in the context of resource-limited settings (as suggested earlier).  The title is clear but could be more precise to reflect the study's key findings and design (as suggested earlier). While the references are comprehensive, consider updating with a few additional recent and relevant studies (as noted earlier). Remove any outdated or less relevant citations unless they provide essential background.	

**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:	Alexander V. Vorobev
Department, University & Country	Sechenov University, Russia