

## Review Form 1.6

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>                          |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_JAMMR_88435  |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Outcome of Laparoscopic Management of undisturbed Ectopic Pregnancy versus Medical Management |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

### 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:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

### 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 | <p>The article needs native editing.<br/>The surgical procedure is not explained well.<br/>The abstract must be completely rewritten.<br/>Why the inclusion criteria for women were 20-35 years old.<br/>Treatment methods are not explained separately and what is the role of tube aspiration in ectopic pregnancy treatment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Outcome: was detected such as: success of treatment, tubal integrity, occurrence of normal pregnancy, recurrence of ectopic pregnancy, complications of treatment.</li></ul> <p>All the initial outcomes are not explained well, for example, how was the tube patency was detected, in which group the patency of tubes was checked, and why was the MTX still given in recurrent case of EP?<br/>Table 1and 2 ,also 3 and 4 should be merged.<br/>Some parts of the result are listed in the discussion section.<br/>What are the strengths and weaknesses of this article?<br/>The discussion section should be written more fluently and duplicate words and PowerPoint format should be avoided.</p> |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      |   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments    |   |   |

### PART 2:

|  | 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) |
|--|---|---|
| Are there ethical issues in this manuscript? | (If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) |   |

### Reviewer Details:

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | Elham Askari                                |
| Department, University & Country | Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Iran |