

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_126337
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological and clinical profile of Covid-19 in pregnant women and newborns
Type of the Article	Narrative Review

Review Form 3

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>This manuscript focuses on the clinical and epidemiological impact of COVID-19 on pregnant women and newborns, a significant area of study during the pandemic. As a narrative review, it lacks the rigor and structure of a systematic review, which diminishes its potential contribution to the scientific community. The importance of the manuscript is marginal, as much of the information has already been covered in existing literature. The manuscript should make a stronger case for its relevance by either presenting a unique perspective or focusing on underrepresented populations or outcomes related to COVID-19 in this demographic.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The current title, "Epidemiological and Clinical Profile of COVID-19 in Pregnant Women and Newborns", while accurate, is somewhat generic. A title that reflects a more focused or nuanced aspect of the study (such as the unique epidemiological challenges in specific regions, or detailed clinical outcomes in mothers vs. newborns) would help draw more attention to the manuscript. A suggested title could be "Epidemiological and Clinical Insights into COVID-19 in Pregnant Women and Newborns: Challenges and Outcomes".</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract is comprehensive but lacks critical engagement with the content. While it summarizes the study well, it does not indicate the limitations of the narrative review methodology or the inconsistencies in the available data regarding vertical transmission. Furthermore, the abstract oversimplifies some findings, such as the outcomes for newborns, without addressing the complexity of varying results across different studies. Including a brief mention of data gaps and the need for further research would provide a more balanced and critical view. The abstract should also better reflect the limitations inherent in narrative reviews, particularly their subjective selection of studies and lack of systematic methodology.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>While the structure of the manuscript follows conventional formats, it feels too segmented in some areas and lacks depth in others. For example, the <i>Methodology</i> section is oversimplified for a narrative review. It merely states that the search was conducted across three databases without detailing the inclusion and exclusion criteria, which raises concerns about bias in the selection of studies. Additionally, the <i>Discussion</i> section could be expanded to critically engage with conflicting findings from different studies, particularly those related to vertical transmission and the long-term effects of COVID-19 on neonates. The <i>Results</i> and <i>Discussion</i> sections should be more clearly differentiated. Currently, they overlap in places, with discussions about implications embedded within the presentation of results. Clarifying this distinction would improve the manuscript's readability and scientific rigor.</p> <p>Typo is METODOLOGY, it should be Methodology. Please check spelling and grammar</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The manuscript presents a relatively accurate summary of the available data on COVID-19's impact on pregnant women and newborns, but it does not go far enough in questioning the robustness of the studies it reviews. For example, many of the studies included have small sample sizes, particularly those on newborn outcomes. The manuscript should explicitly address these limitations and discuss how they affect the generalizability of the findings. Moreover, the paper does not adequately critique the inconsistencies in vertical transmission findings across different studies. Some studies suggest vertical transmission, while others refute it, but the manuscript does not explore why these discrepancies exist, such as variations in testing protocols, timing, or sample types.</p> <p>The scientific rigor of the review is further weakened by the lack of critical engagement with the sources. The review tends to present findings without evaluating the quality of the studies or addressing potential biases, such as the regional variability in healthcare access and maternal health that could influence outcomes.</p>	

Review Form 3

<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>-</p>	<p>While the references cover a reasonable breadth of literature, they are slightly outdated. The majority of the references are from 2020 and early 2021, with only a few from 2023. This is problematic given the rapidly evolving understanding of COVID-19, especially with new variants and changing vaccination statuses that could significantly impact outcomes in pregnant women and newborns. The manuscript would benefit from including more recent studies, especially those that address long-term outcomes for newborns and updated guidelines on maternal and neonatal care. In particular, it should consider more recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses that provide a broader and more up-to-date perspective.</p> <p>An example is this https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11213543/</p>	
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please check spelling and grammar</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>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></p>
<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>Ang Yee Gary</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Singapore</p>