

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_101990
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk Factors of Body Mass Index and Hypertension on Preeclampsia During the Covid-19 Pandemic
Type of the Article	Original research

### 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.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/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)
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. <b>Yes</b> 2. <b>Yes</b> 3. <b>Yes</b> 4. <b>No</b> 5. <b>Yes</b> 6. <b>Yes</b> 7. <b>Unfortunately, the writing is too weak. I cannot understand what they want to say. For example</b>" Maternal and child morbidity and mortality can be increased, one of them by the incidence of preeclampsia" or "Sampling used the simple random sampling method, namely random sampling based on fulfilling the inclusion criteria." <b>And it has no cohesiveness and coherence. It jumps from one subject to another. It is too difficult to follow the text.</b> <b>And why it has a separate part named Literature Review??</b> <b>The methods is not good.</b> "The data was processed using observational analytic techniques and analyzed to determine the relationship between research variables through univariate, bivariate, and multivariate analysis". They should read some articles as patterns to know how to write about the statistical analysis like the name and version of used software and the name of each test which has been used for each analysis.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	No	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	I think it is better to give the authors an opportunity to rewrite it. An English editing company or a person with good English should help them.	

### 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)
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> Yes. They should add a part to this manuscript about the ethical approval. Because they used personal information of patients.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Mahdiah Mehrab Mohseni</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Islamic Azad University, Iran</b>