

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_113564
Title of the Manuscript:	Understanding Preeclampsia Risk Factors and Biomarkers: A Case-Control Study
Type of the Article	

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the manuscript titled "Understanding Preeclampsia Risk Factors and Biomarkers: A Case-Control Study" is important for the scientific community, particularly in the field of maternal and fetal health. Preeclampsia is a serious pregnancy complication that can have severe consequences for both the mother and the baby, and understanding its risk factors and biomarkers is crucial for early detection and management. This study contributes valuable insights by investigating various maternal sociodemographic, obstetric, clinical, anthropometric, and biochemical variables in the context of preeclampsia, providing essential information for local protocols and risk assessment in the Ghanaian population. The findings add to the existing body of knowledge and can potentially inform clinical practice and public health interventions aimed at reducing the burden of preeclampsia. The title "Understanding Preeclampsia Risk Factors and Biomarkers: A Case-Control Study" effectively conveys the focus and scope of the research. However, an alternative title, that you can consider: "Exploring Maternal Biomarkers and Risk Factors in Preeclampsia: Insights from a Ghanaian Case-Control Study", it encloses the whole scenario/ content/ theme. Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a clear overview of the study's aims, design, methodology, key findings, and conclusions. The abstract effectively summarizes the rationale for the research, the population studied (pregnant women receiving antenatal care at the Bolgatanga Regional Hospital in Ghana), the data collection methods (including both medical record review and biochemical analysis), and the main results, such as the association of various factors like caesarean delivery, preterm birth, placental malaria, maternal body mass index, lipid variables, and renal and hepatic biomarkers with preeclampsia. Additionally, it concludes by emphasizing the significance of these findings for assessing preeclampsia risk in the local population. Overall, the abstract provides a comprehensive overview of the study, making it suitable for readers to quickly understand the key aspects and implications of the research. Yes, based on the provided information, the subsections and structure of the manuscript appear to be appropriate for a scientific paper, following a standard format with sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Material and Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically accurate and covers all the necessary chapters and sub contents. Each chapter is well-explained and meets the requirements effectively. The overall presentation weaves together a comprehensive narrative that caters to scholarly expectations. The references in the manuscript are accurate, but they are not cited in a numbered format. It would be more organized to arrange them sequentially and cite them using numbers throughout the text. This approach ensures clarity and facilitates readers' ability to locate specific references within the manuscript. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The article demonstrates a fair language and structure for scholarly communication, adhering to a conventional scientific format that includes sections like Abstract, Introduction, Methodology, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. The language employed is fair, however it can be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>While the article is generally acceptable, but it needs essential corrections and improvements based on the aforementioned suggestions. Incorporating these changes will elevate its quality and render it more suitable for publication.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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:	Salman Zahir
Department, University & Country	Northwest General Hospital and Research Centre, Pakistan