



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>                |
| Manuscript Number:       | <b>Ms_ARJGO_45252</b>   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>CORPUS LUTEAL CYST RUPTURE – AN IMPORTANT DIFFERENTIAL FOR ECTOPIC PREGNANCY</b> |
| Type of the Article      | <b>CASE REPORT</b>  |

**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) |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments | <p>Title</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please include the word case report in the title</li> </ul> <p>Abstract</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please divide the abstract into three sections, Background, case summary and conclusion</li> </ul> <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please mention references</li> <li>Please write a sentence about how this case report throws light on a particular subject matter</li> </ul> <p>Case Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Was the patient followed up after discharge and if yes, please mention the followup findings</li> </ul> <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The case aims to bring out the differences in the the presentation and management of rupture luteal cyst and ruptured ectopic gestation, but the discussion talks only about corpus luteal cyst but doesn't differentiate it from ectopic gestation. The same may be incorporated in the discussion.</li> </ul>          | All the indicated changes are done   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>Introduction:</p> <p>Line 20 – Reproductive <del>systems</del> system</p> <p>Line 21 – full form of CT</p> <p>Line 22 – Patient's</p> <p>Case Report:</p> <p>Line 28 – CBC full form</p> <p>Line 28 – Serology for what</p> <p>Line 32 – full form of ER, PR, BP and SpO<sub>2</sub></p> <p>Line 36 – ECG</p> <p>Line 42 – HCG full form</p> <p>Line 45 - POD full form</p> <p>Line 45 – clots were cleaned from the pelvis (consider restructuring)</p> <p>Line 46 – Patient's condition remained uneventful</p> <p>Line 46 – HPE full form</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>Line 61 – 62 – Repeats with line 62 – 64</p> <p>All discussion – citation style is not in line with the journal's guidelines (kindly read the author guidelines on the journal page for clarity)</p> <p>Line 77 – 79 – How can blood grouping and cross matching help to differentiate corpus luteum cyst from ectopic pregnancy</p> <p>Line 78 and 85 – maintain the same standard abbreviation of hCG throughout the text</p> <p>Line 105 – haemorrhage</p> | All the indicated changes are done   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    | A few mistakes in grammar, spelling, spacing and sentence reconstruction need an English language reviewer   |  |



**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> |   |