

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJOB_97525
Title of the Manuscript:	MORPHOMETRIC AND MORPHOLOGIC ASSESSMENT OF THE PLACENTA, BIRTH WEIGHT AND ASSOCIATED RISK FACTORS IN FULL TERM NEONATES.
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.journalajob.com/index.php/AJOB/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)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the manuscript is important to the scientific community as it adds to significance of best practices often neglected to predict the wellbeing of the mother and the baby. Such records should be used for routine checkups, counselling and treating of newborns with resultant complications in Nigeria and beyond. 2. Yes. Add Nigeria as suggested to tell the reader the study site in the fore front. 3. Yes. 4. Yes. 5. Yes. However, check for correctness as suggested in the reviewed document. 6. References are numbered in the text. However, not listed in te corresponding manner/order!! <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are placentae categorized male/female or of females/males? Check!! • There is no evidence that the researcher(s) tested for racial and ethnic influences. Hence, cannot conclude on this as presented in the discussion!! 	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes.	
Optional/General comments	Correct typos indicated/changes suggested in the reviewed document attached.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Switbert Rwechungura Kamazima
Department, University & Country	Muhimbili University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania