

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_104135
Title of the Manuscript:	Association of natal and maternal risk factors with neonatal Apgar score in Mosul.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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.journalajpcb.com/index.php/AJPCB/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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</li> <li>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</li> <li>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</li> <li>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>I find the manuscript to have important scientific information which is plausible. Furthermore I find the data analysis quite informative and the discussion very rich in in-depth comparative studies which add its quality.</p> <p>The title of the manuscript is suitable.</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive enough, however, the definition and language needs correction. Thus, infant's condition immediately after birth and its reaction. Subsection of patients and methods-Delete patients so that methods remain. Substructures of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>References are within acceptable period though some are as old as 1950, 1953, 1988 and 1997, but these are definitions and strategic references. These can be ignored. However, references are adequate.</p> <p>The current information is clear and adequate.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</li> </ol>	<p>Part of result, please change the language—1 and 5 min were very weakly and insignificantly correlated with the mothers' age. You could use the word—"were not significant" would suffice. Section on discussion--The high proportion of newborns delivered through meconium-stained amniotic fluid with either grade 2 (3.1%) or grade 3 (96.9%)—should read newborns delivered following meconium-stained amniotic fluid...otherwise the rest of the language is okay. Section on conclusion-Mothers was most at risk for obstructed labor, and the mean Apgar scores of their newborns were the lowest. Should read- mothers who had obstructed labor,had newborns with low Apgar score.- Spelling of Labor should be consistent and other sections "b" is missing. Please go through the document again for the sake of clarity.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Alfred A. Osoro</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Uzima University, Kenya</b>