

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_120991
Title of the Manuscript:	A STUDY OF SAFTEY AND EFFICACY OF SUBLINGUAL VERSUS VAGINAL MISOPROSTOL IN PRIMIGRAVIDA AT TERM PREGNANCY WITH POOR BISHOP'S SCORE.
Type of the Article	Research artilcle

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p><i>The study presented offers a comprehensive analysis of sublingual misoprostol's efficacy for labor induction. The comparative approach with other routes of administration (oral and vaginal) and the consideration of different dosages provide a well-rounded understanding of misoprostol's pharmacokinetics and clinical effects. The author's meticulous attention to the different variables and outcomes makes this study a valuable contribution to the field of obstetrics.</i></p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>	<p><i>In addition, it is necessary to detail the methods used to assess cervical readiness within the Materials and Methods section. This includes describing the specific techniques and criteria used to evaluate the cervix, such as the Bishop score or other relevant assessment tools, and the frequency of these measurements throughout the induction process.</i></p> <p><i>Identify the specific modification of the Bishop scale used in the work and the frequency of measurements taken.</i></p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p><i>The "SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION" section should be removed, leaving only the main information.</i></p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p><i>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness by employing a well-defined methodology and a clear division of patients into two distinct groups, allowing for a direct comparison of sublingual and vaginal misoprostol administration. The inclusion criteria and study setting are clearly described, providing transparency and reproducibility. Additionally, the manuscript references established guidelines from reputable organizations such as ACOG and NICE, lending credibility to the choice of misoprostol as the agent for labor induction. The detailed analysis of outcomes, including the effectiveness and safety of the intervention, further supports the scientific robustness and technical soundness of the study.</i></p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p><i>Please include citations from the reference literature list to support key points in the study</i></p> <p>[]</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p><i>It would be beneficial to note the causes of cesarean sections and the degree of cervical maturity at the time of surgery.</i></p> <p><i>To enhance clarity and accessibility for all readers, could you please provide definitions or explanations for the terms PROM, PIH, IOL and others.</i></p>	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vladislava V Khalenko
Department, University & Country	D. O. Ott Research Institute of Obstetrics, Russia