

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19454

Title: Ovarian simple cysts in asymptomatic postmenopausal women detected at transvaginal ultrasound: A review of literature

Reviewer's code: 00742113

Reviewer's country: Greece

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-09 20:58

Date reviewed: 2015-05-20 11:55

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"/> 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting manuscript. To be published, after adding more information regarding the role of CA125 and RMI score. Please also add a limitation paragraph.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19454

Title: Ovarian simple cysts in asymptomatic postmenopausal women detected at transvaginal ultrasound: A review of literature

Reviewer's code: 00742054

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-09 20:58

Date reviewed: 2015-06-09 14:43

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 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 checked="" 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In addition to my comments below, please see the paper for my other comments. Thank you! - It would be better if the authors provide the prevalence of ovarian cysts in the general population of the menopausal women (regardless of trans-abdominal or trans-vaginal diagnostic ultrasound). Then, they explain how and why trans-abdominal and trans-vaginal ultrasound may result in different diagnosis of the cysts. This will help understand the reason of the exclusion criteria c. - Exclusion criteria: why did you exclude the studies with sample size more than 50? This does not make sense while you report results of the studies that had had 15735 participants (in Greenlee et al study) or 48230 (in Shrama et al study). Please clarify.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology

ESPS manuscript NO: 19454

Title: Ovarian simple cysts in asymptomatic postmenopausal women detected at transvaginal ultrasound: A review of literature

Reviewer's code: 00742368

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-05-09 20:58

Date reviewed: 2015-06-28 05:35

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 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"/> 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Nice review. I wonder whether these studies included tumor markers, what is the role to tumor markers in the followup-this should be commented on Another question that poses itself, what kind of surgery is performed (laparoscopy vs laparotomy?) what prompted removal in these studies? what is the duration of follow up before attempted removal? What percentage of these cysts eventually required surgery? some suggested changes are included in the manuscript