

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_98248
Title of the Manuscript:	Actual Birth Weight Prediction at term using Clinical and Ultrasound methods at Federal Medical Centre, Keffi, Nasarawa State: A comparative Approach.
Type of the Article	

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.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/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. The manuscript is important to the scientific community in that it adds to the body of knowledge about fetal weight estimation which is very important in decision making in obstetrics. 2. The title of the article is adequate 3. The abstract is comprehensive 4. The subsections and structure of the manuscript is adequate except for the methodology section. The authors need to state who did the measurements clinically and sonologically and the level of competence. Also if one person did the measurements or different people. Also in the discussion section, the authors did not mention any drawbacks to their study 5. The manuscript is scientifically correct 6. The references are sufficient but not recent. Only 3 references were written in the last 5 years	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is suitable for scholarly communication	
Optional/General comments	Why is "Source: Author's Work" written under tables 1-3?	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Amaka N Ocheke
Department, University & Country	University of Jos, Nigeria