

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57277

Title: Aspect atypique d'une rétention placentaire à propos d'un cas

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

✓ **Accept after minor revision.....**

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study

- Focuses on a rare and clinically important atypical presentation
- Detailed case description with multiple hospital admissions
- Good use of different imaging modalities including ultrasound MRI and angioscanner
- Figures on page 3 clearly show radiological findings supporting diagnosis
- Stepwise clinical management is well described
- Correlation with anatomical pathology strengthens diagnosis
- Discussion supported with relevant literature

Weakness of the study

- Single case report limits general applicability
- No mention of ethical clearance or patient consent
- Language and grammar issues present in some sections
- Some sentences are lengthy and difficult to follow
- Limited discussion on differential diagnosis
- Repetition of clinical details in observation section
- No structured limitation section

Reviewers Comments

The manuscript presents an interesting case of atypical retained placenta with multiple admissions due to postpartum hemorrhage, which highlights the diagnostic challenges in such cases. The case is well described, and the use of imaging modalities such as ultrasound, MRI, and angioscanner adds strength to the diagnostic process, as seen in the images on page 3 showing uterine lesions and suspected retention. The discussion appropriately explains the clinical difficulty in diagnosis, especially when initial ultrasound findings may be normal, as described on page 2. However, ethical clearance and patient consent are not mentioned and should be clearly included. The writing is understandable but requires improvement in grammar and sentence structure. Some parts of the manuscript are repetitive and could be made more concise. The study is limited by being a single case report and lacks broader clinical comparison. Overall, the manuscript is clinically relevant and informative but needs improvement in reporting standards and language before publication.