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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes/No

YES

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments:

NO

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes/No

YES

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

YES

a. The relevant patient information, including:

- De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity) YES

- Main symptoms of the patient YES

- Medical, family and psychosocial history YES
- Relevant past interventions and their outcomes YES

b. The relevant physical examination findings YES

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month. NO

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
- Diagnostic methods YES
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural) NO
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable N/A

e. Types and mechanism of intervention YES

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits YES

Comments:

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented? YES
Comments:

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.
   Yes/No
7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments:
YES

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments:
YES

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
There are certain issues not clear in the case presentation
1. The blood pressure reading 80/P mmhg is vague
2. Right lower and upper tenderness is not clear
3. The tumour size at ultrasound scan is 95 x 65 cm. That seems too big and contradicts the laparoscopic findings of about 10x15 cm
4. It will be better for you to include results of tests done before surgery. Her hemoglobin level and hematocrit level is important because 400 ml hemoperitoneum cannot justify the unstable hemodynamic state mentioned in the case presentation unless there was prior anemia
5. One of your differential diagnosis was ruptured ectopic pregnancy; did you perform plasma beta hCG assay before surgery? Could you please enumerate all the tests done before surgery.
6. Check Page 4, Line 3: No further bleeding was to be seen
7. Page 4, Line 4: You said that she refused laparoscopic myomectomy and preferred open surgery. However, you also stated that she underwent diagnostic laparoscopy under general anesthesia.
Was it not for technical reasons that you preferred laparotomy over laparoscopy? If she did not consent to laparoscopy then why the diagnostic laparoscopy?
8 In the discussion section

Page 5, Line 8; verify emergent surgery

9. You should also include the ultrasound image to see how the dimensions of the fibroid were obtained

10. Cases of post-partum rupture of blood vessel on uterine tumours/fibroids have been described in the literature. It would be interesting to do a literature search because in such conditions it will pose difficulties in diagnosis and treatment. This will enrich your discussion.

11. Could you please use FIGO 2011 classification to describe fibroid?
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