

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_113419
Title of the Manuscript:	Risk of Serum Ionized Magnesium among Women with Preeclampsia
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><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. This study shows that low serum ionized magnesium is a risk factor for development of Pre-eclampsia similar to other studies. Measurement of serum ionized magnesium may come as a screening test for Pre-eclampsia in the future.</p> <p>Grammatical error in the title.</p> <p>Low Levels of Serum Ionized Magnesium as a Risk Factor for Pre-eclampsia/ Risk of Pre-eclampsia in women with low serum ionized magnesium</p> <p>Abstract is comprehensive. But grammatical errors and incomplete sentences are there in the abstract. Please explain, how age matched controls were taken as it is mentioned in the abstract.</p> <p>Yes, but there is duplication of results in discussion</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Majority of references are not recent. Please try to add more recent articles if available.</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Grammatical errors are there in many areas</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>Few questions to be addressed are</p> <p>1. If it is a case-control study, how did you calculate sample size and please mention in the manuscript</p> <p>2. Is there any specific reason to include women from 24 weeks rather than > 20 weeks</p> <p>3. What is the significance of comparing systolic and diastolic blood pressure in cases and controls when controls are women with normal blood pressure</p> <p>It is mentioned in abstract that age matched controls were taken, when age groups were compared in the study. Please explain</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Blessy John
Department, University & Country	KIMSHEALTH Hospital, Bahrain