SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_ARJGO_49991**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Intra-operative detection of asymptomatic perforated Copper T- A case report**
Type of the Article	**Case report**

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)

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	1. **Abstract is very long. Please edit it.** 2. **Why was the Copper T not seen during USG done for the MTP? The author says that CU-T thread was seen at the time of surgery.** 3. **Was suturing done at the site of uterine perforation? The images shared by the author reveal a defect in the uterus.**	Abstract length is reduced as advised. Diagnosis during USG depends on expertise of sonologist. Also there was history of expulsion, so it might have been missed. Suturing was not done as there was no active bleed from the site of perforation.
Minor REVISION comments	1. Please check for grammatical and spelling errors . eg.:""A 32 year old Gravida 5 Para 4 with 4 living children presented to us for MTP with laproscopic ligation" 2. Kindly correct the spacing in between words.	It has been corrected
Optional/General comments	Please add more relevant references. There are many such cases of misplaced Copper T , kindly add the relevant details from them.	