

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_96464
Title of the Manuscript:	PROPOSAL FOR A NEW CLASSIFICATION OF CESAREAN SECTIONS FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: EXAMPLE OF A MULTICENTER STUDY IN FIVE MATERNITY HOSPITALS IN DAKAR
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.journalijrrgy.com/index.php/IJRRGY/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1-Very important  2-Yes 3-Yes 4-The study is excellent and author has constructed true indications of caesarean sections in developing countries but it could be more interesting if author has mentioned how he constructed the common themes and made four classes. Otherwise it is a very useful study and may get international focus. 5-yes.the author has reported study method as prospective. But it is mentioned the data was collected from the records which gives reader a suspicion of retrospective study. The author should make it clear that record of which duration was included to make it prospective. 6-Yes.They are mixed references and to the point.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes;excellent	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	This study is fit for publication.	

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

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Shazia Saaqib</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Allama Iqbal Medical College, Pakistan</b>