

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJCRMH_99343
Title of the Manuscript:	Intracranial hemorrhage in pregnancy : case report and review of literature
Type of the Article	Case study

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajcrmh.com/index.php/AJCRMH/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1) NO 2) YES 3) YES 4) YES 5) NO 6) NO The manuscript is not scientifically written and has inadequate grammatical form. Lower case letters were used at the beginning of the sentence and after the period. Capital letters were often used. The sentences are sometimes confusing and meaningless. In a manuscript the authors are referenced in the text and listed in the reference list. We tried to make some adjustments, believing it to be a typing error, but it is clear that the entire text has the same problem. The manuscript is fragile in all its items.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Inappropriate	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Valmin Ramos Da Silva
Department, University & Country	Universidade Estadual De Minas Gerais, Brazil