

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_103443
Title of the Manuscript:	Furghanization of Surrogacy
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>)

Review Form 1.7

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><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>yes</p> <p>Better to expand like a crosssectional/observational etc. study</p> <p>yes ;Aim is diffuse ,Methodology very short.Better to remove the word 'goal.'</p> <p>yes</p> <p>yes</p> <p>It's better to follow the author's guidelines. Numbering in the text and for references is needed.</p> <p>Methodology: type of study, duration, sample size, etc. is better to improve.</p> <p>Questionnaire standardization is needed.</p> <p>It is better to mention the measures to decrease the bias.</p> <p>limitation; better to mention a lack of generalisability.</p> <p>A discussion is better written as a research article than a review.</p> <p>It is better to mention references for religious quotes.</p> <p>Keywords are better to be in MeSH terms and in alphabetical order, and they are better not to be in the title.</p> <p>Ethical committee number is better to mention.</p> <p>SPSS version country is better to mention.</p> <p>Are you taking both male and female infertility into account? The title is in favor of female infertility. Usually, the answers and score will be different for male and female infertility. It's better to explain.</p> <p>Is there any score better to mention?</p> <p>It is better not to repeat the same sentence in the abstract and introduction.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>It's better to improve some spelling and grammar mistakes.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rakesh Kotha
Department, University & Country	Osmania University, India