

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17522

**Title:** Avoiding misdiagnosing an early intrauterine pregnancy as an ectopic pregnancy

**Reviewer's code:** 00742113

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-16 20:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-06 15:38

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

well written. To be accepted.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17522

**Title:** Avoiding misdiagnosing an early intrauterine pregnancy as an ectopic pregnancy

**Reviewer's code:** 00742373

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-16 20:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-08 12:57

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the manuscript titled: "Avoiding misdiagnosing an early intrauterine pregnancy as an ectopic pregnancy", Dr. Donald L. Fylstra reviewed the misinterpretation of ultrasound imagings, hCG levels, and progesterone level during pregnancy. The co-exist of ectopic and intrauterine pregnancies is also discussed. The author suggest every effort should be made to exclude the presence of intrauterine pregnancy before embarking on irreversible treatment for ectopic pregnancy with methotrexate. The point of the review is important. The written of the manuscript is very well and clear. It is helpful for clinical readers avoid misadministration of methotrexate to an intrauterine pregnancy. Minor concerns: \* It is is not common with the subtitle of "material and methods, results" in a mini review or review. It is suggested to use "Clinical characteristics of ...." \* Figure 1 has a shadow in the middle. Is it possible to change another one?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17522

**Title:** Avoiding misdiagnosing an early intrauterine pregnancy as an ectopic pregnancy

**Reviewer's code:** 00452844

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-16 20:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-27 21:03

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a mini review on how to avoid the misdiagnosis of an early intrauterine pregnancy as an ectopic pregnancy. The article is well written but there are some points that need to be addressed: 1. First of all the author has missed some more recent review articles and meta-analyses related to the diagnosis of tubal ectopic pregnancy (Ultrasound Obstet Gynaecol 2015, J Clin Image Sci 2014, 4, 37). Usually, reviews are systematic reviews therefore the present manuscript is closer to an opinion paper. 2. The structure of the article is rather strange including a very short Introduction, Materials and Methods but without data and the rest of the article is "Results". An explanation should be provided. 3. During the last few years other markers have been used or at least have been introduced as a potential diagnostic markers of ectopic pregnancy such as sFlt-1, PlGF, activin A, angiogenetic factors and others and this should be mentioned by the author in the Discussion section.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17522

**Title:** Avoiding misdiagnosing an early intrauterine pregnancy as an ectopic pregnancy

**Reviewer's code:** 00742368

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-16 20:19

**Date reviewed:** 2015-03-29 21:26

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well written review on the diagnosis of ectopic pregnancy with an additional twist in view of the recently reported cases of intrauterine pregnancies inadvertently exposed to methotrexate. My reservations One additional algorithm added to the literature. Such an alogorithm is not tested (what % of cases fall into each category). I assume that most patients would fall in the non-diagnostic category. Also such an algorithm is not tested in real life for sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive value. In addition, the algorithm starts with measurement of the endometrial stripe, the sign which is least supported in the literature with marked variability in what is considered normal in different studies The statement "A low serum progesterone can justify endometrial curettage to differentiate between a failing intrauterine pregnancy and an ectopic pregnancy". In a previous reference, if we intervene for a level of Progesterone <16, we would perform endometrial sampling/curettage on 57 out of 64 pregnancies that would have resolved spontaneously. Algorythm is mis-spelled. Ostensible should be changed to ostensibly (although I do not like this word is this context