

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJGO_122170
Title of the Manuscript:	Massive Transfusion Protocol: A Boon For Salvaging Patients Of Massive Obstetric Hemorrhage
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>
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.		
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)		
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.		
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?		
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.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Thank you for inviting me to review manuscript entitled "MASSIVE TRANSFUSION PROTOCOL: A BOON FOR SALVAGING PATIENTS OF MASSIVE OBSTETRIC HEMORRHAGE". I am glad to revise this valuable manuscript; following are my comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I strongly suggest to revise the manuscript in terms of grammatical issues. For example using Lacs is not appropriate. Our study aimed to primarily know the maternal outcome-survival and life-threatening complications after a massive blood transfusion this is not correctas well. There are many other issues as well. 2. The abbreviations can only be used after initially being introduced. The author used many abbreviations before mentioning them as a whole. 3. "Using a fixed ratio of red cell concentrate (RCC) to fresh frozen plasma (FFP) at 1:1, and a RCC:FFP ratio of 1:1:1". The highlighted part is incorrect. 4. Explain statistical analysis methods in detail. 5. Explain the scientific aspect of methods. There is no need to explain the location of the city. 6. Results and discussion must be seperated. 7. How did Authors come to the conclusion of 1:1.02:0.8 ratio. 8. The authors reported so many datas in the result section but they did not mention the amount of products that patients received. 9. The overall ratio among the blood products given in MTP to patients with massive obstetric haemorrhage in our institute between PCV: FFP: PC: CP was 1:1.02:0.8:2. What is PC? 10. What were the oxytocis used? 11. Ask for a consult for statistical measures. 	

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>Firoozeh Madadi</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>SBMU, Iran</p>