

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_109659
Title of the Manuscript:	Pseudomyxoma Peritoni From An Ovarian Mucinous Cystadenoma
Type of the Article	Case study

### 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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)  2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)  3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?  4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?  5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?      6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.  <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	<p>This manuscript is important as it contributes to our knowledge on this rare case.</p> <p>Yes, title is suitable.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>The term thick ascites was used by the author. However, the quality of the ascitic fluid is better differentiated during ultrasound scan compared to CT. In CT the appearance of the ascitic fluid is mainly homogenous. Furthermore, the role of CT scan is also to look for distant metastases which was not mentioned at all.</p> <p>It was mentioned that the tumour ruptured spontaneous intraoperatively. Can the author describe this better? Was there a break in the cyst wall leading to presence of the mucinous fluid?</p> <p>The author mentioned hyperthermic intraoperative chemotherapy as the treatment of choice. However, this patient had peritoneal lavage with sterile saline and dextrose. Perhaps the author can further explain why this is so.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Generally, it's an interesting case. However, this was done in Dec 2011. Why did the author choose to write up about it now? It will be more meaningful if the author can add more to the paper in terms of radiological findings, role of tumour markers and the indication for intraperitoneal chemotherapy.	

Review Form 1.7

**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>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Nuguelis Binti Razali</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>University Malaya, Malaysia</b>