

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_125089
Title of the Manuscript:	Analysis Of Stillbirth As Per ReCoDe Classification System: A Cross-Sectional Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This article emphasizes the usage of ReCoDe classification system in the identification of stillbirths. It also emphasizes the need for such a classification system to identify and classify the causes of stillbirths incases where histopathological analysis is not possible.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Suitable.	
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.	Abstract of the article is adequate. The classification serves to classify stillbirths from which conclusions could be drawn to prevent them in the near future. ReCoDe classification of author's findings have been projected well. 22 weeks have been used. 28 weeks could've been used for universality as the author himself has suggested. In results and discussion, most of the stillbirths were found to be in primigravidas. But in discussion, 2/3 have been attributed to multigravidas. Is this an error? If Histopathology was feasible, it could've been added to show the credibility of using ReCoDe classification system. Or a reference indicating such a study could have been added.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Introduction of the manuscript is exhaustive. Few more subsections could be added to make the script more appealing to readers. Certain sentences are repeated in the manuscript.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	ReCoDe Classification use for analysis of stillbirth is proven and correct. If Histopathology was feasible, it could've been added to show the credibility of using ReCoDe classification system. Or a reference indicating such a study could have been added.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	References are sufficient.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	English quality is suitable	
Optional/General comments	The article overall emphasises that the cause of stillbirths can be identified solely by ReCoDe classification system without having to rely on histopathology. It can be used when the bereaved parents are not willing for autopsy. It can serve as a key tool to the medical community to identify the cause of death to some extent and to make amendments.	

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:	Monisha
Department, University & Country	Government Hospital, India