

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Gynaecology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJRRGY_123742
Title of the Manuscript:	Maternal Outcomes in High-Risk Pregnancies: A Comparative Analysis of Intervention Strategies and Their Efficacy in the US.
Type of the Article	Systematic review

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 systematic review is very useful as it is illustrating various interventions that could be used to have better feto-maternal outcome.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It needs revision in order to make it self-explanatory like Comparison of Interventional strategies implemented to manage high risk pregnancies in terms of their efficacy at United States of America: A Systematic review	
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 is comprehensive and crisp. Only change the study design as "Systematic Review"	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Scientifically robust and sound as is reflecting multiple interventions to manage high risk pregnancies that healthcare professional of developing countries can implement in their health facilities or at least suggest high risk mothers keeping in view the feasibility of respective intervention.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	References are of last 10-11 years; however, there is need to add their DOI (of published articles) or their online links (particularly of the books or WHO websites) for authenticity	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
Optional/General comments	SEE ATTACHMENT	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Rizwana Shahid
Department, University & Country	Rawalpindi Medical University, Pakistan