

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_97533
Title of the Manuscript:	COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF SERUM LIPID PROFILE AND URIC ACID BETWEEN PREGNANT NORMOTENSIVE AND PREGNANCY-INDUCED HYPERTENSIVE WOMEN IN PORT HARCOURT
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 comments not cross sectional or descriptive study	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)	1. The manuscript is quite important for scientific community as knowledge about pregnant women 2. The title of the article is rather not suitable. Change the title according to the purpose : Comparative assessment of serum lipid profile and uric acid between normotensive and Hypertensive pregnant women in Port Harcourt. 3. The abstract of the article is not comprehensive. There is no background that n the basis for conducting this research. The aims is ok. The method is not cross sectional study but comparative study because or others is analysed by using chi-square. Results and conclusion is Ok. Keywords : normotensive, Hypertensive. Lipid profile, Uric acid, Pregnancy. 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript should be repaired especially the method is replaced. Criteria of normal blood pressure and hypertension were not included or whether participants had systemic diseases and others. 5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct in method 6. From 16 references, there are 4 references that are more than 10 years old This article is quite useful	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The English language quality of the article is quite suitable for scholarly communications	
Optional/General comments	This is Comparative study	

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> Yes but the ethics are already in the article	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Fanny Margaretha Laihad
Department, University & Country	Hang Tuah University, Indonesia