

### Review Form 3

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | Asian Research Journal of Gynaecology and Obstetrics  |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_ARJGO_123542   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | An Observational Study On The Effect Of Maternal Booking Body Mass Index On Pregnancy Outcomes At The Benue State University Teaching Hospital, Makurdi |
| Type of the Article      | Original Research Article   |

#### PART 1: Review Comments

| <b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments  | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|---|
| <b>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.</b>                        | Maternal booking of body mass index on pregnancy outcomes is very important as it is a burden for many countries due to extremes of socioeconomic distribution. On one side of the spectrum, there is overweight and obesity which has reached epidemic proportions and on the other side there is underweight and undernourishment. This study will highlight the importance of it. |   |
| <b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>  | <b>Yes</b>   |   |
| <b>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.</b>   | <b>Could be modified</b>   |   |
| <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>  | <b>Could be improved</b>   |   |
| <b>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.</b> | <b>The introduction section has to be improved<br/>Methodology has to be more clear<br/>Discussion needs more valid supporting points</b>  |   |
| <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>   | <b>Yes</b>   |   |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments<br><br><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>   | No. Has to be improved a lot   |   |
| <b>Optional/General</b> comments   | The whole manuscript has to be re-wriitten   |   |

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

|   | <b>Reviewer's comment</b>  | <b>Author's comment</b> <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> |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b> | <i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> |   |

**Reviewer Details:**

|                                  |   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Name:                            | <b>Krishnaraju Venkatesan</b>               |
| Department, University & Country | <b>King Khalid University, Saudi Arabia</b> |