



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>)



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>Abstract:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The abstract is too long and needs to be shortened (almost half of the total length of the paper) <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The introduction is scanty and needs to be supplemented with more information - The authors may add information on the percentages of symptomatic and asymptomatic perforations - Also a small note on the dangers of perforation maybe added with relevance to the context - The existing introduction is mostly a repetition of the introduction, please avoid repetitions <p>Case Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please consider mentioning the reason for which the patient sought MTP - Consent obtained from relatives – which relative ? - Please mention post operative management in terms of antibiotics / prophylaxis of anaerobic infections spreading into the peritoneal cavity - Follow-up of the patient doe or not, and if done, when and how <p>Discrepancy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Minilap – the pictures show a larger incision that is not consistent with a minilap incision - The authors have mentioned the displaced device to be CuT 375, but the device in the picture appears to be a multiload device - Line 85 mentions that the CuT was inserted 6 weeks ago ? this is not mentioned in the history (if she had a CuT insertion 6 weeks ago please mention the details of the same) <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please discuss why the Cu-T was not removed with laparoscopy and what was the need for doing a laparotomy / minilaparotomy - MoHFW, Government of _____ - Line 77 to 81 – Please compare the pros and cons of leaving the IUCD in the peritoneal cavity in light of MoHFW guidelines and other studies <p>References:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please mention recent references related to this topic <p>CONSENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please mention if the patient's consent was obtained or not for publication of this case report 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Line 64 – IUD (Please maintain consistency in abbreviation use) 	
Optional/General comments	The authors may kindly refer to the CARE guidelines (https://www.care-statement.org/) for publication of case reports to make your paper more robust and scientifically apt. The checklist is freely available on the link mentioned above	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mohammed Ismail Khan
Department, University & Country	ESIC Medical College, Hyderabad, India