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This is a case report to show the uterine rupture at the secondary trimester in a woman with history of cesarean section. Some comments are shown below.

The much more detailed information of the patient's history should be provided. For example, how many times of cesarean section were performed for this woman? Rupture site of the current case? How to repair the defect? What is the meaning of the "no fetal pulse"? Did the authors detect the fetal pulse in routine? Why the authors failed to provide the laboratory data for this woman? Based on the authors' comments, a point of care ultrasound is very important. However, the vital signs seemed to be uncorrelated to her severity, because of her pulse of 72 beats/minute and regular, and blood pressure of 110/80 mm Hg. It is relatively strange for our understanding of the clinical course. In addition, hemoperitoneum might be accompanied with severe pain and muscle guarding, rebound pain. The clinical course of the patient could be presented as flow-chart.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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