Wednesday, October 14, 2015
Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (**file name: 17922-review.doc**).

Title: POSTPARTUM INTRAUTERINE DEVICE (IUD) CONTRACEPTION, A REVIEW

Author: Shadi Rezai, Pameela Bisram, Hasan Nezam, Ray Mercado, and Cassandra E Henderson

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

ESPS Manuscript NO: 17922

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1. Format has been updated
    1. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer
    2. Reviewer's comment file also completed and answered.
2. There is no conflict of interest
3. Authors Agreement form and copyright form is signed by all authors

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*.

Regards,

Cassandra E Henderson MD, CDE

Cassandra E. Henderson MD, CDE
Director of Maternal Fetal Medicine
Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology
Lincoln Medical and Mental Health Center
Bronx, NY, 10451, USA
Email: Cassandra.henderson@nychhc.org
Tel: (718) 579-5513

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242 Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology
ESPS manuscript NO: 17922
Title: POSTPARTUM INTRAUTERINE DEVICE (IUD) CONTRACEPTION, A REVIEW
Reviewer's code: 00742054
Reviewer's country: Australia
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2015-03-31 13:44
Date reviewed: 2015-04-23 10:42

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS:

A) I have made my specific comments on the paper.
Manuscript was revised according to your kind recommendations

B) General comments:

1. The paper needs major language and punctuation polishing. The errors and mistakes in language and punctuations make some sections difficult to understand. Your paper will benefit from being edited by a native English-speaking academic.

   The Manuscript was revised and revised by Dr. Henderson, who is a native English Speaker.

2. Do any of these studies that have been reviewed identify the time of expulsion, infection, perforation etc.? For example, one of the studies you reviewed in the Result section as as follows: "One clinical trial evaluated levonorgestrel IUD use one year after planned

cesarean in 42 women randomized to receive post placental insertion (within 10 minutes) at the time of scheduled cesarean or to delayed insertion 4-8 weeks after cesarean. The post placental IUD insertion group had a significantly higher expulsion rate than the interval insertion group (20% (4/20) vs. 0% (0/22), p = 0.04).” Does the paper mention the time of IUD expulsion? If you can find these information from the reviewed studies this will add more value to your work. **Could not find the time of expulsion**.

3. There are numbers in brackets throughout the Result section whose meaning and purpose are not known. For example, on page 5, paragraph 1, you wrote the following: “27 % (4/15) expulsion rate was similar for the for the IPP/EP groups, while no expulsions occurred in the interval INT 0 % (0/16). In addition, these 2 groups also reported significantly less pain upon insertion”. What do (4/15) and (0/16) mean? Does it mean 4 out of 15? If yes, which group had 15 subjects? This is seen throughout the results section and makes it difficult to understand the meaning of the reports. I have highlighted some of them.

   Manuscript revised.

4. You may summarize the results of the review for the studies in a Table.
5. Great amounts of results have been repeated in the discussion section. You may need to remove repetitive parts, combine some of them and use sub-headings in both Results and Discussion section for ease of understanding and make your paper flow.

   Manuscript revised.