

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-53418

Date: 20.08.2025

Title: Levonorgestrel Intrauterine System (MIRENA): Initial Experience in the Management of Abnormal Uterine Bleeding

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. Divyaparvathy J

Reviewer's Comment:

This well-structured article effectively demonstrates the safety and efficacy of the Levonorgestrel Intrauterine System (Mirena) as a conservative treatment for abnormal uterine bleeding (AUB), presenting a clear methodology and strong results. The findings, which show a significant reduction in bleeding and a high patient retention rate, are well-supported by comparisons to existing literature.

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Detailed Reviewer's Report

- 1.** Introduction: The introduction is well-written, but it could be enhanced by briefly mentioning the potential economic benefits or quality-of-life improvements from avoiding hysterectomy.
- 2.** Methodology: The methods section is clear. However, it would be beneficial to include a more precise demographic detail, such as the mean or median age of the participants.
- 3.** A brief definition of the "no-touch technique" would also be helpful for non-specialist readers.
- 4.** Results: Supplementing the figures with more detailed textual descriptions would strengthen the narrative.
- 5.** It would also be a good idea to include some form of statistical analysis to show the significance of the findings over time.
- 6.** Discussion: The discussion is strong in its comparison to existing literature. For added value, consider briefly explaining the physiological mechanism by which Mirena reduces bleeding.
- 7.** Expanding on the clinical implications of the findings would also be useful.
- 8.** Limitations: The study's limitations regarding small sample size and potential for follow-up bias are appropriately acknowledged. No further changes are needed here.