

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_118458
Title of the Manuscript:	The Use Of CTPA In Diagnosing Pulmonary Embolism During Pregnancy And Puerperium Period: A 5 years Retrospective Study At A Regional Referral Hospital in Malaysia
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalarjgo.com/index.php/ARJGO/editorial-policy> )

### 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><b>Compulsory</b> 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, as it is showing the sensitivity of CTPA in detecting PE and correlation of CTPA with MWS.</p> <p>The title should be slightly modified as it is not taking account the MWS which is one of the objectives of the study and they have already explained the correlation of CTPA with MWS.</p> <p>Yes, it is well written in structured format.</p> <p>Yes, very well written.</p> <p>Yes, it is scientifically correct and important.</p> <p>Yes, they are sufficient and many of them are recent.</p> <p>There are no CTPA images included in the study. It should be must to include few good representative CTPA images depicting positive findings of the study.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, well written.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>Discussion about radiation hazards of CTPA in pregnancy and whether it was explained to the patients should also be included in study.</p> <p>Spacing is not proper at many places, so please give proper spacing wherever required.</p>	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	Aniket Madhukar Zope
Department, University & Country	Symbiosis Medical College for Women, Symbiosis University Hospital and Research Centre, Symbiosis International (Deemed University), India