

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_130358
Title of the Manuscript:	Role Of Upper And Lower GIT Endoscopy In Patients With Suspected Bilateral Adnexal Masses
Type of the Article	Retrospective Observational Clinical Study

#### **General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it addresses a clinically significant issue: the need for a more tailored approach to gastrointestinal evaluation in ovarian cancer patients. It explores how endoscopic procedures, such as upper and lower GIT endoscopy, can contribute to diagnosing metastatic ovarian cancer, while also emphasizing the importance of non-invasive diagnostic methods like imaging and tumor markers. By demonstrating that routine gastrointestinal endoscopy may not be necessary for all patients with suspected ovarian cancer, it could lead to cost savings in healthcare, particularly in resource-limited settings. The study's findings could inform clinical practice and decision-making, potentially reducing unnecessary procedures and focusing resources on patients who would most benefit from endoscopy.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, the title "Role of Upper and Lower GIT Endoscopy in Patients with Suspected Bilateral Adnexal Masses" is suitable. It clearly conveys the main focus of the study, which is the role of gastrointestinal endoscopy in ovarian cancer patients with bilateral adnexal masses. Alternatively, the title could be slightly rephrased for clarity and conciseness, for example: "Evaluating the Role of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy in Diagnosing Metastatic Ovarian Cancer in Patients with Bilateral Adnexal Masses".	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	Yes, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, including background information, methods, results, and conclusions. It effectively summarizes the key findings and the study's significance. However, the abstract could benefit from a brief mention of the study's limitations (such as sample size or potential biases) or future directions for further research.	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	Yes, the manuscript appears scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and logical manner. The study follows standard statistical procedures, and the analysis of tumor markers, imaging, and endoscopy results seems accurate. Additionally, the conclusions drawn align with the data presented.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references appear sufficient, but there could be a few more recent articles included to provide a broader context, especially in terms of advancements in imaging techniques and tumor markers for ovarian cancer. Adding references from the past 1-2 years would help keep the manuscript up to date with the latest findings.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language quality is suitable for scholarly communication. The writing is clear and professional, with minimal grammatical errors. The tone is appropriate for a clinical research study.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Overall, the manuscript is a significant contribution to the field of ovarian cancer diagnostics. The findings are robust and provide a clear rationale for a more focused approach to endoscopy in patients with suspected ovarian cancer and bilateral adnexal masses. The study's implications for reducing unnecessary procedures and healthcare costs, while ensuring accurate diagnosis, make it a worthwhile read for clinicians and researchers alike. With some minor revisions to address limitations, expand on future research directions, and incorporate more recent references, the manuscript would be even stronger.	

#### PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>Shashi Prakash</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>S. N. Medical College, India</b>