



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_46539
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of the success rates of vaginal sonography and hysteroscopy in diagnosis of intrauterine pathologies in infertile women
Type of the Article	

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>I strongly recommend you to re-read your paper carefully, as it contains lots of English mistakes and it requires English correction. Also some sentences don't make sense or have errors and duplicates. For example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Different technological devices can diagnose intrauterine abnormalities the most common of which are certain procedures such as hysteroscopy and transvaginal sonography (TVS) 2. The protocol of the study, the brands of the instruments, and the materials used to conduct the procedure. (incomplete sentence) 3. Check the Results section: information about polyp diagnostics is duplicated (the whole paragraph). 4. The paragraph about Table 4 is actually about myoma, not polyp. Compare the data on method characteristics with abstract data. When you correct the paragraph to "myoma" you would have to correct this number: The diagnostic specificity rate of both VTS and hysteroscopy in diagnosing polyp in the infertile women was 92.30%, and therefore the two methods had equal specificity rate in diagnosing uterine myoma in the studied infertile women (Table 4). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Was corrected 2. It was the comments of author that mentioned in the text and was omitted. 3. Was omitted. 4. This is translation error and in Persian version it was ok. Thank you for your precise review.
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the abstract conclusion I would write:hysteroscopy is more sensitive for endometrial hyperplasia diagnosis... 2. Examining for and diagnosing uterine abnormalities can affect the result of ART and is considered one of the important therapeutic procedures before treatment of infertility. What does this acronym stand for? 	Both of them were corrected.
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>	