

### 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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>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.</b>	This manuscript is of great importance to the scientific community because despite previous successes with aromatase inhibitor therapy in breast cancer, this article shows that there is no association between the influence of hormonal status on the outcome of maintenance therapy in high-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC). By addressing this relatively underexplored aspect of ovarian cancer treatment, the study opens new avenues for personalized medicine, potentially improving treatment strategies for patients based on their hormonal profile. The research contributes valuable insights that could enhance clinical decision-making, offering a more tailored approach to therapy and potentially improving patient outcomes. Additionally, the manuscript adds to the growing body of evidence in ovarian cancer research, fostering further exploration of targeted therapies and their efficacy in different patient subgroups.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It clearly and concisely communicates the main focus of the research. The title is well-structured, informative, and highlights the key elements of the study, making it appropriate for an academic audience.	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It effectively summarizes the main objectives, methodology, key findings, and the significance of the study, providing readers with a clear overview of the research. The abstract successfully captures the essence of the study, making it informative and accessible for the scientific community. Although, it could be better to briefly mentioned insignificant difference between groups.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct. It presents information that aligns with current knowledge in the field, uses appropriate terminology, and follows accepted methodologies and research standards. The conclusions drawn are supported by the evidence provided, making the manuscript scientifically sound.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent. The manuscript includes a well-rounded selection of up-to-date sources that support the research and reflect the current state of knowledge in the field.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The writing is clear, precise, and follows academic conventions, ensuring that the content is accessible to a scholarly audience. The use of appropriate terminology and formal tone reflects a strong understanding of the subject matter.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In addition to letrozole to use another aromatase inhibitor like Anastrozole in combination with letrozole. Moreover, it can be useful to mentioned ethnical background of patients. In the article it was mentioned to use PR status as an additional prognostic indicator but it doesn't have the same efficacy as ER H-score positive or combination of both ER and PR positivity.	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Lala Akhundova</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>MS ERA Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnologies, Azerbaijan</b>