

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 (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.	The manuscript provides more insight on the use of massive transfusion in obstetric practice and more so this hospital or community. The author says that a similar study was conducted a few years before, but d highlight onew of changes but doesn't highlight differences either in practice or study procedures.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The tittle would be made better by highlighting the study site and or the research method	
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.	The abstract is comprehensive, but however, has a number of undefined abbreviations	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate however some of the contents appears misplaced eg, parts of the discussion in the result section and parts of the introduction in the discussion	
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.	The study type was appropriate for the objectives. The massive transfusion as key word wasn't however, given due importance in the data collection and discussion. The aurthor also highlighted that the were mobidities that could have been due underlying patient conditions of which these couldn't be separated. This could be articulated better as a confound or as an association since no causal relationship has been studied and identified	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The real discussion of results has no references and the statements that would have been in the background or introduction have some.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is suitable. A few gramatical errors and typos to be rectified	
Optional/General comments		

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lwasa Joel Njagala Calls
Department, University & Country	Makerere University College of Health Sciences, Uganda