

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 68006

Title: Post-salpingectomy interstitial heterotopic pregnancy after in vitro fertilization and embryo transfer: A case report

Reviewer's code: 03967085

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Bulgaria

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-09 10:01

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-15 12:58

Review time: 6 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The title is informative and relevant. The references are relevant and recent. The cited sources are referenced correctly. Appropriate and key studies are included. The introduction reveals what is already known about this topic. The research question is clearly outlined. The case is well-described, the used methods methods for diagnosing and therapy were valid and reliable. The patient data is presented in an appropriate way. The illustrative materials are relevant and clearly presented. Data is discussed from different angles and placed into context without being overinterpreted. The conclusions are supported by references and own results. This paper added to what is already in the topic. The article is consistent within itself. Specific comments on weaknesses of the article and what could be improved: Major points - none Minor points

1. Th authors put author contributions in the acknowledgement section;