

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_95763
Title of the Manuscript:	Pregnancy and its Outcomes in a Tertiary Care Hospital of Northern India: A Retrospective Study
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>)

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> <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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>The title is well-defined with much precision. Author should mention the name of the hospital in the abstract section "SSB Heart and Multispecialty Hospital" Author should replace 'millennium development goals' with 'sustainable development goals' Author should indicate to readers that bars are used to display study results and specific figures should be mentioned to bolster the section. Study design is also not indicted.</p> <p>No It has much prospects but cannot be accepted in the current form. Author should reshape everything No, in-text references are poorly done. Please check lines 1-3 in the introduction section, references are indicted as [1,7] instead of [1,2]. The subject matter has a lot of published papers author can make reference from, however, only 9 papers were finally consulted in the reference section.</p> <p>The entire sections are scanty and not convincing as a serious academic paper. Problem statement in the introduction section is not clearly carved out.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes with some few typos. Examples, Results section: October is wrongly spelt as 'Octoberi.e.'</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The manuscript important for the scientific community so I wish author could make time and reshape the entire paper for the second time</p>	

PART 2:

Review Form 1.7

	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:	Jones Asafo Akowuah
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana