



EUROPEAN SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL
by European Scientific Institute



Paper: “Migration of an IUD into the myometrium associated with a painful ovarian cyst: A case report”

Submitted: 21 November 2025

Accepted: 28 December 2025

Published: 31 January 2026

Corresponding Author: Samake Yaya

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2026.v22n3p54

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Rozeta Shahinaj
Medical University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Rozeta Shahinaj	
University/Country: Medical University of Tirana, Albania	
Date Manuscript Received: 24.11.2025	Date Review Report Submitted: 01.12.2025
Manuscript Title: MIGRATION INTO THE MYOMETRIUM OF THE IUD ASSOCIATED WITH A PAINFUL OVARIAN CYST.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 16.12.2025	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The title is understandable but not fully clear. It must be clarified that this is a case report.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The abstract presents the introduction, case report, discussion, and conclusion.	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Several sentences contain grammatical errors, incorrect verb tenses, or awkward phrasing. The text requires language polishing for clarity and fluency.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This is a case report article, and there is no method section. The case report must be written in more scientific terminology. The timeline and symptoms should be described more precisely:	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> This is a case report article, and there is no results section. The case report must provide a clearer description of the operative findings using standard terminology. A concluding sentence should highlight the educational value of this case report.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> The conclusion lacks a clear clinical message of this case report, the importance of proper insertion technique of IUD, the need for post-insertion follow-up, and the management approach when migration is suspected.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> References are incomplete and often outdated (1970s–1990s predominance). The discussion relies heavily on older literature; it must consider integrating recent systematic reviews.	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

I think the article needs minor corrections. Several sentences contain grammatical errors or awkward phrasing (e.g., “The intrauterine device (IUD) or IUD...”). The text requires language polishing for clarity and fluency.

Clarify the timeline: Was the laparotomy performed during the Caesarean or as a separate procedure? Clarify whether the entire IUD was embedded in the myometrium or only partially. The connection between the migrated IUD and the ovarian cyst is unclear. State whether these findings were related or incidental. The surgical steps could be described more precisely (e.g., “cystectomy and removal of the intramyometrial IUD”).

Include the patient’s age, parity, and indication for Caesarean section—important contextual information for case reports. Avoid long sentences; shorter, clearer statements improve readability. The discussion relies heavily on older literature; consider integrating recent systematic reviews.

Provide a short, focused summary of the clinical relevance of this case. Clarify that the ovarian cyst was ultimately a benign serous cystadenoma and likely incidental. Mention how this case contributes to the literature or clinical practice.

References are incomplete and often outdated (1970s–1990s predominance). Please update with more recent literature on IUD perforation, migration,

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only: