

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Endocrinology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRE_101893
Title of the Manuscript:	ULTRASOUND ASSESSMENT OF THYROID VOLUME IN PREGNANCY IN THE NIGER DELTA REGION OF NIGERIA
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.journalajrre.com/index.php/AJRRE/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	<p>Yes, since thyroid diseases in pregnancy are common and mostly asymptomatic one has to screen to identify thyroid diseases. Also it has effect on newborn early identification and treatment is essential.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, with one minor modification in results section.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>References are sufficient but only few recent articles are mentioned, can add up few more if possible.</p> <p>Need to insert recent references</p>	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Revise the language	
Optional/General comments	14 women of the 38 (36.8%) had focal hypoechoic lesion while 24 (63.2%) had focal hypoechoic nodule (Figure 2). PLEASE DO CORRECTION.	

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

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anil Reddy J
Department, University & Country	DNB Center, India