

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_105131
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of Non-Stress Test Alone Versus Biophysical Profile in Management of High-Risk Pregnancy: A comparative study
Type of the Article	Original paper

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>)

Review Form 1.7

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. The manuscript is scientific.</p> <p>Yes. It's suitable.</p> <p>No. In method, where and when the study was conducted. In result, the percentage was missed. Conclusion must be shorten.</p> <p>Yes. I suppose despite the scientific limitation.</p> <p>All references are so old, more than 20 years. Please updated.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>All the manuscript, english editing is strongly recommended. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bad obstetric history→poor obstetric history. - Pre-eclampsia was high in Group B than in Group A→ Pre-eclampsia was higher in Group B than in Group A. - Therefore, the results of the present study may not be representative of the whole of the country or the world at large.-->Therefore, the findings of the present study can not be representative for the large population. - In table 2: Ostdated Pregnancy→postdate pregnancy, Decized foetal Movement→reduced fetal movement. Anti partuin Jiaeiiorr liage (APH)→the typing error ????. In table 9: Admission in Paediateix word, what does it mean? 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Introduction must be more focused.</p> <p>In the method part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculation study sample size must be included. - Definition of gestational age must be described. - Some commonly clinical presentations such as PROM, fever, placenta previa, placenta accreta spectrum with vaginal hemorrhage should be mentioned in inclusion or exclusion criteria. - Please describe if the evaluation was performed before induction of labor. - Criteria used for NST following ACOG-2009 or RCOG. Who read it?. Please add this point. - If the NST was discontinuous and BPP was not completed, the participant was eliminated from the study? - If the NST and BPP were repeated many times on the same patient, which result was used for analysis. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A written informed consent from all the participants must be mentioned in the method. - A study flow chart and algorithm must be given. - During the investigation, if the patient was diagnosed with fetal distress or hypoxia, the fetal intrauterine reanimation was performed and NST was continuously monitored or cesarean section was indicated. - Apgar score is the important variable, this must be clearly described how this is evaluated. - Definition of qualitative and quantity variables as well as nominal variable is required. The distribution of data are clearly described. - The name and version of software for randomized method and data analysis needed to be described. <p>In result section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table 3 shows the determination of gestational age of pregnant women in both groups→Please clarify this sentence and Table 3. This is very difficult to understand. - In Table 4, does normal vaginal delivery include also the assisted instruments such as vacuum, forceps? - Table 9 is really difficult to understand. - All the tables must be reconstructed. - Statistical tests must be added where applicable. <p>All the manuscript, English editing is strongly recommended. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - bad obstetric history→poor obstetric history. - Pre-eclampsia was high in Group B than in Group A→ Pre-eclampsia was higher in Group B than in Group A. - Therefore, the results of the present study may not be representative of the whole of the country or the world at large.-->Therefore, the findings of the present study cannot be representative for the large population. - In table 2: Ostdated Pregnancy→postdate pregnancy, Decizased foetal Movement→reduced fetal movement. Anti partuin Jiaeiiorr liage (APH)→the typing error ????. In table 9: Admission in Paediateix word, what does it mean? <p>The discussion should be expanded with the pH of umbilical cord and head scalp as well as computerized.</p> <p>The paragraph should be divided into the the sentences in thorough paper.</p> <p>Conclusion must be re-written.</p> <p>The results almost are not significant, and in the clinical practice, NST can not be replaced with BPP because BPP takes a long time to evaluate and the findings remain controversial.</p>	
--	--	--

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Ethical approval must be given with ID, number, and name of institution.</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Phuc Nhon Nguyen
Department, University & Country	Tu Du Hospital, Vietnam