

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_114213
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of fetomaternal outcome in abruptio placenta and placenta previa
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> 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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes, it is a good topic and findings may inform the scientific community on how to adapt the current efforts of addressing cases of antepartum haemorrhage. However, Major changes are needed especially on statistical analysis especially the choice of statistical analysis which is best suited for comparison studies.</p> <p>Yes, It is good one.</p> <p>Yes, but need major changes especially on method and presentation of results. On method, the author shall add the place of the study. On results, The results shall be presented in best way using data. Example if the author is mentioning maternal and fetal complications: They must be presented in terms of numbers (data).</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes, but major changes must be done.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, but the author must work on organization and flow of ideas. Example: The subsection of introduction, readers expect from author(s) to present the case of APH. During this subsection, it was good to start presenting the epidemiology of APH and its maternal and fetal outcomes globally, then at region level and then in his country/county and why the topic is of interest for reader. The current contents are not enough and not organized in best way. This is applied to others subsection also.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

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

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ntihabose Corneille Killy
Department, University & Country	Rwanda