



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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
Optional/General comments	Please add more relevant references. There are many such cases of misplaced Copper T , kindly add the relevant details from them.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rana Choudhary
Department, University & Country	Wockhardt Hopsital, Mumbai, India