

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JAMPS_95378</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>CORRELATION OF ULTRASOUND UMBILICAL VENOUS BLOOD FLOW IN NORMAL PREGNANCY WITH GESTATIONAL AGE AND FOETAL WEIGHT</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### 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.journaljamps.com/index.php/JAMPS/editorial-policy> )

### **PART 1:** Review Comments

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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><b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li><b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li><b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li><b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>The paper explored the linear increase in UV blood flow volume with foetal BPD and AC suggests that these three parameters could be used in combination to estimate both GA and FW. This study is potentially interesting and clinical value. However, I notice the following issues: The figure legends don't give the clear explanation(e.g. Figure 1 should be marked with arrows to show umbilical blood flow velocity is measured). Correlation analysis should be included in the statistical methods presentation throughout the text(Abstract, Data Analysis,Results and Figure legends). In the section "Table 5 further demonstrates the relationships between UV parameters and GA.", the difference between the parameters at 20 and 40 weeks should be further analysed statistically(e.g.T test)for any differences.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></li> </ol>	<p>References need to be updated for recent years.</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>Mingxing Ding</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Medicine, Jinhua Polytechnic, P.R. China</b>