

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pregnancy and Childbirth
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPCB_111875
Title of the Manuscript:	Pregnancy outcome following previous miscarriage at Benghazi medical center
Type of the Article	Original Research 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"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The manuscript addresses an important topic regarding the outcomes of pregnancies in mothers with a history of miscarriage. Understanding the potential implications for caesarean delivery, early pregnancy bleeding, prematurity, and low birth weight in this population is valuable for the scientific community, especially in the context of maternal age, education, and comorbid conditions. 2 The title, "Outcomes of Pregnancies in Mothers with Previous Miscarriage: A Retrospective Study," is generally suitable. However, it could be enhanced for clarity and specificity. An alternative title might be "Maternal and Obstetric Outcomes in Women with a History of Miscarriage: A Retrospective Analysis." 3. The abstract provides a good overview of the study, summarizing the key aspects of maternal characteristics, outcomes, and recommendations. However, it could be improved by including more specific details about the methods used in the study and the key findings. 4 The manuscript follows a logical structure, with sections addressing maternal characteristics, outcomes, and recommendations. However, subsections within each major section could be more clearly delineated for easier readability. Consider providing more detailed subheadings to enhance the organization. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5 The scientific content appears generally correct, with relevant data and statistics presented. However, some sections lack specific details on methodology, and additional information on statistical analyses would strengthen the scientific rigor. Authors should provide more information on the study design, data collection methods, and statistical tests used 6 The references cited are relevant, but the inclusion of recent literature would strengthen the manuscript. Additionally, providing more context for the references within the text would enhance the scholarly impact. Consider integrating recent publications related to maternal outcomes and miscarriage to support and contextualize the study's findings 7. In-depth Exploration of Obstetric Complications: The study could benefit from a more detailed exploration of specific obstetric complications mentioned. Providing insights into the types and frequencies of complications observed, along with their clinical implications, would offer a richer understanding of the maternal health challenges faced by women with a history of miscarriage. 8. Demographic Analysis: While the study includes essential demographic information, a deeper analysis of socio-economic factors, cultural influences, and regional disparities could contribute to a more comprehensive interpretation of the results. Understanding how these factors intersect with maternal and obstetric outcomes may uncover nuanced patterns that can guide targeted interventions. 9. Discussion on Preeclampsia Findings: Given the limited occurrence of pre-eclamptic disorders in the study, a brief discussion on potential reasons for this low prevalence and its implications could add value. Exploring whether the study population's characteristics or other factors contribute to this observation would enhance the manuscript's scientific depth. 10. Acknowledgment of Limitations: While the limitations are mentioned briefly, expanding on specific challenges faced during the study, such as recruitment issues, data collection constraints, or any unexpected obstacles, would provide transparency. Acknowledging these limitations contributes to the study's integrity and helps contextualize the findings. 11. Future Research Direction: The manuscript would benefit from a more explicit section on future research directions. Identifying specific gaps in knowledge uncovered by the study and proposing avenues for further investigation could guide researchers interested in building upon this work. 12. Consistency in Units: Ensuring consistency in units across measurements, especially in the results section, is crucial for clarity. Double-checking and standardizing units for parameters like BMI, hemoglobin levels, and vitamin D levels would prevent potential confusion for readers. 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>13. Clear Hypothesis or Research Question: Clarify the main research question or hypothesis at the beginning of the manuscript. Clearly stating the study's objective would provide readers with a roadmap and better context for interpreting the subsequent findings.</p> <p>14. Detailed Methodology Section: Provide a more detailed description of the study methodology, including the recruitment process, inclusion and exclusion criteria, and any specific interventions or treatments administered. A thorough methodology section ensures transparency and replicability of the study.</p> <p>15. Patient Confidentiality: Confirm that the manuscript adheres to ethical standards regarding patient confidentiality. Ensure that no personally identifiable information is disclosed, and consider providing information on how participant privacy was safeguarded during the study.</p> <p>16. Highlight Clinical Implications: Clearly articulate the clinical implications of the study's findings. Discuss how the results contribute to existing knowledge and offer insights that can inform clinical practice or healthcare policies related to maternal care for women with a history of miscarriage.</p> <p>17. Strengthen Conclusion Section: Revisit the conclusion section to succinctly summarize the key findings and their broader implications. Emphasize how the results contribute to the current understanding of maternal health and what practical steps can be taken based on these findings.</p> <p>18. Consistent Citation Style: Ensure consistency in the citation style throughout the manuscript. Cross-check references to ensure they align with the chosen citation format (e.g., APA, MLA) for clarity and professionalism.</p> <p>19. Proofread for Language: Conduct a thorough proofreading to address any remaining language or grammatical issues to enhance readability and reflect positively on the overall quality of the research.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The language and English quality of the article are generally suitable for scholarly communication. The manuscript is well-written, and the language is clear and coherent. However, there are some areas where minor grammatical and syntactical improvements could enhance the overall clarity and professionalism of the writing. Consider a thorough proofreading to address these minor issues and ensure a polished presentation. Overall, the manuscript is easily understandable, facilitating effective communication of the research findings.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The study delves into pregnancy outcomes post-miscarriage, shedding light on crucial factors. While structured well, language improvements are crucial. Adequate references. The article's relevance to the scientific community is notable, warranting consideration.</p>	

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)
<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>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Amanuel Admasu Yayna</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Wolaita Sodo University, Ethiopia</p>