



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>  |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_JAMMR_46539</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Comparison of the success rates of vaginal sonography and hysteroscopy in diagnosis of intrauterine pathologies in infertile women</b> |
| 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**

|  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>   | <b>Author's comment</b> (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) |
|--|---|--|
| <p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> | <p>The theme dealt here is important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abstract: comparison of A vs. B in the factors of X, Y and Z (polyp, hyperplasia, and myoma) should be better written as follows.<br/><br/>For X, Y, and Z, A showed the sensitivity of x,y, and z, respectively, and specificity of x', y', and z', respectively. For them, B showed the sensitivity of x,y, and z, respectively, and specificity of x', y', and z', respectively. Or, you can further shorten the one. The present one is redundant. The same is true in the text. Edit them.</li> <li>You demonstrated "three" disorders in this study, polyp, hyperplasia, and myoma. However, you state here and there as if uterine congenital anomaly is a main target. As you state, the gold standard of endpoint here is the pathology and thus, uterine congenital anomaly cannot be included in this study population. I mean that you here studies three conditions BUT you mentioned "uterine congenital anomaly" very frequently. Readers may be greatly confused in this paper structure. Delete all statement as to uterine congenital anomaly because you did NOT study it. Rather, state it as the study limitation. "We here only focused these three disorders but congenital uterine anomaly is another very important cause of infertility that requires ultrasound or hysteroscopic diagnosis. Since in this study we employed pathological diagnosis as the gold standard for endpoint, we did not show sensitivity/specificity of these two methods for congenital uterine anomaly, which was the study limitation." (this is an example).</li> <li>Simply comparing sensitivity/specificity of ultrasound vs. hysteroscopy has less sense. Because: 1) you already know the ultrasound data and thus you employed hysteroscopy: one DOES know the lesion before doing hysteroscopy, 2) hysteroscopy can provide therapy and pathology, thus with these being completely different meaning as modalities. You touched the latter meaning in the text but I strongly recommend that you should state these two definitely as study limitations. This is like comparing barium enema vs. colo-fiberscope. This is like comparing laparoscopic examination of the PCO vs. ultrasound examination of it. Definitely state this. You compared things of different nature/characteristics. Hysteroscopy is complementary to ultrasound.</li> </ol> <p>Reference does not adhere to the paper writing rules. Copy and Paste PubMed and after that edit it according to the journal regulation. Do not write it by your self, looking at the reference itself.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p>      |   |  |



SDI Review Form 1.6

|                                  |  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments |  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|

**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>Shigeki Matsubara</b>               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>Jichi Medical University, Japan</b> |