

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_99766
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of m-health Application to figure out Post-natal Depression, An Evidence-Based Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The topic of the manuscript is the “Use of m-health Application to figure out Post-natal Depression, An Evidence-Based Study”.</p> <p>The topic is significant and very important. As the effect of m-Health application for treatment of post-natal depression may have significant effect on the improvement of health of mothers as well as effect on the family well-being, such studies and their presentation is important for the medical community.</p> <p>The paper is in line with the scope of the journal and will be a valuable contribution both to our knowledge and to practice.</p> <p>Yet, the paper needs revision before accepting for publication.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title is OK. 2. The abstract also needs re-writing. The authors have to make it more precise. 3. Methodology. Has to be clarified and made very precise! Example: How many subjects took part in this study? Why 1258 is 74,2%, while 1380 - 72%? Check again the numbers and the percentages, i.e. page 2 “Consequently, out of 1,258 patients, 140 coincide to the positive category and 1,258 to the negative category [8].” 4. The text. Spell and gramma check must be used. A careful second read will avoid spelling and typo mistakes, missing commas, etc. It will also help delete duplications of texts (page 6 – 7). Nouns must agree with their verbs (page 3 “, distressing event in life are studied”) ... For the good order, the full name has to be added when an abbreviation is used for the first time in the text. Example: PPD = postpartum depression. The full name is on page 3. The paper starts with the statement “PPD is a Phase which describe the duration of biological evolution between the newborn and the mother”. Re-phrase this; as such, statements are not correct. Table 1 – check it again. Is column 2 (Number missing) so essential? The sums of different categories cannot exceed 100%! The total number of subject in different categories vary, i.e. Educational level = 1378, while Gender of the newborn = 1394. It is worth indicating somewhere this as well as to explain why there is such a discrepancy Page 8 – explain: “As a result of systematic research, it has been revealed that mobile applications substantially enhance postpartum depression.” and in the paragraph just below “This research demonstrated that smartphone application users experienced significant reductions in PPD.” Explain Figure 1. Explain Table 2. Discussion – check the text and make it more precise. Add new lines, capital letters, etc., where necessary. Add “Conclusions”. Apply the same style to all references cited in the text. 5. References listed are sufficient. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

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:	Malina Jordanova
Department, University & Country	Space Research and Technology Institute, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Bulgaria