

Intrauterine fetal death product as a foreign body in the urinary bladder – A case report

Nahid MA et al. (nahid1abudmc@gmail.com)

Mechanical review

| Comments (10-Aug-2023) | Author's response (12-Aug-2023) |
|---|---|
| Please follow the journal's submission guidelines and format your manuscript accordingly. | We have re-arranged our case report as per the author's instruction. Please check attachment. |

Technical review

| Reviewer's information | | | |
|---|---|--|----------|
| Date review assigned | 24-Nov-23 | Date review completed | 5-Dec-23 |
| Reviewer name | Jannatul Ferdous | Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s? | No |
| ORCID | 000-0003-0738-3983 | Do you wish to be disclosed to the author? | Yes |
| Reviewer's comments (06-Dec-2023) | Score [out of 10] | Author's response (23-Jan-2024) | |
| | | [Please write a response if score is less than 6. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.] | |
| 1. How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript? | 7 | - | |
| 2. Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner? | 6 | - | |
| 3. Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge? | 7 | - | |
| 4. Does the manuscript meet ethical standards? | 5 | Given a the "Ethical approval" statement as follows: Ethical approval was not sought because this is a case report. However, consent was obtained from the patient to prepare this manuscript. | |
| There are some minor points to be corrected as follows: | | | |
| 1. In case management section at the line number 6 it was mentioned that The growth was also adhered to UB wall, uterus and ileum but it was not mention whether there was injury in the ileum. | | 1. Ileum wasn't injured. | |
| 2. In the same section (case management section) at paragraph 4, the name of the histopathologist was mentioned which in not necessary. Only the department of pathology is enough. | | 2. Revised accordingly. | |
| 3. In the reference section the proper Vancouver method has not followed. So this section needs correction. | | 3. References are formatted into Vancouver style. | |
| 4. Acknowledgements section at least gratefulness to the patient for her cooperation can be mentioned. | | 4. Acknowledgement section has been added. | |
| Reviewer's Recommendation | Revisions Required | | |

| Responsible Editor's comments (06-Dec-2023) | | Author's response (23-Jan-2024) |
|--|---------------------|--|
| Name | M Mostafa Zaman | [Please write a response each points. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.] |
| ORCID | 0000-0002-1736-1342 | |
| Further to the editor's points: | | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your Abstract could have 150 words. 2. Add two Learning points instead of Highlights. 3. Although the storytelling is good, you have lots of acronyms that reduce the readability. Kindly keep the acronyms as minimal as possible. I suggest removing UB, FB, KUB, DJ, LUTS because many potential readers will not be from your specialty. 4. Use the Vancouver style for the references. List all authors (not et al.). Add DOIs to all journal articles. 5. The ORCID iD is mandatory for at least one, the lead author or corresponding author, and optional for others. | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revied the Abstract. Now it's 132 words. 2. Added. 3. I have reduced the acronyms as much as possible. 4. Referencing is now as per Vancouver style. I have mentioned all the authors. 5. Added ORCID ID Number |
| Editor's Decision | Minor Revision | |

| | |
|---|--|
| Final decision of the Executive Editor (15 Feb 2024) | ACCEPT We shall edit the manuscript soon for your concurrence. |
|---|--|