

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_127983
Title of the Manuscript:	National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death (NCEPOD) classification for Urgency of Caesarean Section: A Prospective Observational Study
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>We want to submit the commented article, "National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death (NCEPOD) Classification for Urgency of Caesarean Section: A Prospective Observational Study." to your journal.</p> <p>First, thank you so much for involving me in reviewing this manuscript.</p> <p>🚩 Positive feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Complex but well-conducted and understandable well-structured graphs, tables, images, and scientifically valid results. ❖ The results are efficient and offer great potential for enhancing user experience. <p>🚩 Of course, the article perhaps needs further enhancement in some areas, and the following are several suggestions for the authors to consider.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The specific study site is unclear and must be clarified. ✓ The methods must include hypothesis/study site, location/study time-window (including date/month/year) primary and secondary outcome measures, and in- and exclusion criteria analysis of the data. ✓ comparisons between different countries, and historical and human aspects have not been presented enough. The authors need to answer: the importance of the National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death (NCEPOD) classification for the Urgency of Caesarean Section ✓ How did the author's team obtain the sample for the study? I hope the authors can answer the sample acquisition process, screening criteria, problems in handling the sample and their solutions, and try to say that your sample is typical and representative. ✓ here is the sample size calculation determination ✓ Unclear and difficult to easily understand the English language it needs further improvement ✓ Inadequate and recent bibliography with many invalid references <p>🚩 The authors must include the Strengths and limitations of this study.</p> <p>🚩 The authors must acknowledge all participants and the one who funded this project</p> <p>🚩 You mentioned in the declaration part that Ethics approval and consent to participate Were approved by the Ethics Committee of Hebei Fifth People's Hospital, so where is the ethical approval number?</p>	

Review Form 3

	<p>✚ Overall, the article is good and it needs further improvement</p> <p>✚ It is recommended to be published after major revision.</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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Getachew Mekete
Department, University & Country	Debre Tabor University, Ethiopia